

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1129, the Microcredit for Self-Reliance Act. H.R. 1129 grants express authority to the United States Agency for International Development [USAID] to provide grants and loans in support of microenterprise programs in developing countries. The legislation directs that approximately one-half of the grant assistance provided under the USAID's program be used by poverty lending programs to the very poor, particularly poor women, under which loans of \$300 or less are provided. I especially would like to thank Mr. Hall of Ohio for his authorship and leadership on this very important bill.

Microenterprises are very small, informally organized businesses, other than those that grow crops. Often microenterprises employ just one person, the owner-operator or "micro-entrepreneur." In some lower-income countries, however, microenterprises employ a third or more of the labor force.

Importantly, the Microenterprise program is targeted at businesses run by and employing the poor. The Microcredit programs seeks to help the poor increase their income and assets, raise their skills and productivity, and form organizations that facilitate their more effective participation in society. In so doing, programs receiving USAID funding incorporate the following principles: a commitment to significant outreach of services, a continued focus on women and the very poor, a striving for sustainability and financial self-sufficiency, an adherence to rigorous performance standards, a sharing of information on best practices, and a fostering of innovation in programs.

Microcredit is a poverty eradication program. It is a program that provides opportunity and independence to the poor and to impoverished women in particular. In fact, more than 90 percent of microcredit loans have gone to women. Providing women access to microcredit enables them to open their own businesses and in so doing helps to build independence in male-dominated cultures.

Access to microcredit helps to educate women. It raises their income and, thus, that of their families. It has been well-documented that educated women have fewer children, have more time between births, and, therefore, have fewer health problems and have healthier children.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1129 and in so doing, signal their support for this important program that does so much to empower women and improve the quality of life for impoverished families around the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1129, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO GERMAN GOVERNMENT'S DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MEMBERS OF MINORITY RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the discrimination by the German Government against members of minority religious groups, particularly the continued and increasing discrimination by the German Government against performers, entertainers, and other artists from the United States associated with Scientology, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 22

Whereas since World War II, Germany has been a friend and ally of the United States; Whereas German government discrimination against members of minority religious groups, particularly against United States citizens, has the potential to harm the relationship between Germany and the United States;

Whereas artists from the United States associated with certain religious minorities have been denied the opportunity to perform, have been the subjects of boycotts, and have been the victims of a widespread and well-documented pattern and practice of discrimination by German Federal, State, local, and party officials;

Whereas the 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996 United States Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights in Germany all noted government discrimination against members of the Church of Scientology in Germany;

Whereas the German State of Baden-Wuerttemberg barred Chic Corea, the Grammy Award-winning American jazz pianist, from performing his music during the World Athletics Championship in 1993, and in 1996 the State of Bavaria declared its intention to bar Mr. Corea from all future performances at State sponsored events solely because he is a member of the Church of Scientology;

Whereas the Young Union of the Christian Democratic Union and the Social Democratic Party orchestrated boycotts of the movies "Phenomenon" and "Mission Impossible" solely because the lead actors, Americans John Travolta and Tom Cruise, are members of the Church of Scientology;

Whereas members of the Young Union of the Christian Democratic Union disrupted a 1993 performance by the American folk music group Golden Bough by storming the stage solely because the musicians are members of the Church of Scientology;

Whereas the Evangelical Christian Church of Cologne, led by an American clergyman, Dr. Terry Jones, had its tax-exempt status revoked by the German government with the reason being that the church benefits to society were of "no spiritual, cultural, or material value";

Whereas the German government is constitutionally obligated to remain neutral on religious matters, yet has violated this neutrality by supporting and distributing information to the general public that gives the impression that "sect-experts", who are only critical of all but the major churches, are in a position to provide the public with fair, objective, and politically neutral information about minority religions;

Whereas the Jehovah's Witnesses' application for recognition as a corporation under public law, which would have put them on

equal legal status with the Catholic and Protestant churches, was denied by the Federal Administrative Court because the church's doctrine of political neutrality was considered to be antidemocratic;

Whereas government officials and "sect-experts" are using the decision denying the Jehovah's Witnesses recognition as a corporation under public law as a justification for discriminatory acts against the Jehovah's Witnesses, despite the fact that a constitutional complaint is still pending before the German Constitutional Court;

Whereas adherents of the Muslim faith have reported that they are routinely subject to police violence and intimidation because of their ethnic and religious affiliation;

Whereas the 1994 and 1995 Reports to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations on the application of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion and Belief by the Special Rapporteur for Religious Intolerance criticized Germany for restricting the religious liberty of certain minority religious groups;

Whereas Germany, as a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Helsinki Accords, is obliged to refrain from religious discrimination and to foster a climate of tolerance; and

Whereas Germany's policy of discrimination against minority religions violates German obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Helsinki Accords: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) continues to hold Germany responsible for protecting the rights of United States citizens who are living, performing, doing business, or traveling in Germany, in a manner consistent with Germany's obligations under international agreements to which Germany is a signatory;

(2) deplores the actions and statements of Federal, State, local, and party officials in Germany which have fostered an atmosphere of intolerance toward certain minority religious groups;

(3) expresses concern that artists from the United States who are members of minority religious groups continue to experience German government discrimination;

(4) urges the German government to take the action necessary to protect the rights guaranteed to members of minority religious groups by international covenants to which Germany is a signatory; and

(5) calls upon the President of the United States—

(A) to assert the concern of the United States Government regarding German government discrimination against members of minority religious groups;

(B) to emphasize that the United States regards the human rights practices of the Government of Germany, particularly its treatment of American citizens who are living, performing, doing business, or traveling in Germany, as a significant factor in the United States Government's relations with the Government of Germany; and

(C) to encourage other governments to appeal to the Government of Germany, and to cooperate with other governments and international organizations, including the United Nations and its agencies, in efforts to protect the rights of foreign citizens and members of minority religious groups in Germany.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] is in opposition to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] in opposition to the resolution?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of the resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would claim the time in opposition to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is if Mr. GILMAN would give half of his time for those who are in favor of the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to yield appropriate time to the gentleman from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] will control 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

[Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, while I do not take pleasure in bringing this resolution to the floor criticizing Germany, we must be frank with our friends. And when repeated treaties have failed and the matter is serious enough, we must not hesitate in speaking frankly and on the Record.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the German public officials have displayed an unfortunate record of speech and action against minority religions, action that, in my opinion, amounts to discrimination and violation of German obligations under international law.

This resolution calls attention of the public to those actions, calls upon Ger-

many to change its behavior, and asks the President to take appropriate action. I will not belabor these issues and will provide a longer statement under leave to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] is sponsor to this resolution, as well as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY], each of whom has taken a great interest in this legislation and are deserving of our commendation. The resolution has been considerably broadened and softened in the course of its consideration in the committee. And Members may refer to the amendment now at the desk, copies of which are available on the floor.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I first became aware of the problem of religious minorities in Germany well over a year ago when I had the opportunity to visit with American citizens about the problems that their coreligionists had in Germany.

I have had the opportunity to discuss this on several occasions with German Government officials. I have raised this issue in the context of my profound respect for Germany as a friend of the United States. More than a friend, it has become an especially close ally and, in addition, a country that has done a great deal in recent years to protect and uphold human rights around the world. This matter may distress our German friends. But we must be frank with friends.

The German Government perceives Scientology and certain other religious minorities as dangerous or not valuable to their society and as not having the right to the same privileges as other religions. I am sympathetic with German concerns that its history requires that its society be vigilantly protected against totalitarianism. We are all too familiar with how small organizations can grow into important threats to human rights and world peace.

Let me be clear. I have criticized some of the tactics of the Church of Scientology in its public relations campaign against Germany. The use of Nazi imagery by the church or its supporters to characterize the present Government of Germany is improper and unacceptable. But we cannot allow our distaste for some of the tactics of Scientology's supporters to undermine our concern about individual rights if we believe they are violated.

The fact is that healthy democracies such as Germany have potent weapons against groups when they take actions that actually threaten their societies. Democracies need not and ought not to discriminate against people based on matters of conscience or affiliation.

I am particularly concerned when discrimination against individuals on religious ground is encouraged. While some public officials may have an honest belief in the truth of their accusations, the political process can encourage politicians to engage in scapegoating and playing to public prejudices for partisan gain. This can, as we know—as Germans above all know—end in tragedy.

In this connection, I am dismayed with regard to some of the remarks that have been reported to have been uttered by German officials responsible for the protection of the Constitution.

For example, in the course of an interview printed on October 13 of this year in *Die Welt*,

ostensibly devoted to discussing anti-Western, extremist trends within Islam, Peter Frisch, head of the German Federal Office of the Protection of the Constitution, stated that "there are several tens of thousands of Muslims in Germany who are converts from Christianity. There is one Islamic center that has expressly issued instructions to marry German women. The women would then convert to Islam and their children should be brought up accordingly." This sort of irrelevant, hate-mongering rhetoric is unbefitting of an official charged with safeguarding human rights. This is the same official, by the way, who is today investigating Scientology.

During the period leading up to the consideration of this resolution in committee, and thereafter, there have been accusations that the German Government has been denied the opportunity to make its case. I would note that it is not the normal practice of our committee to call foreign ambassadors as witnesses and there was no request from the German Ambassador to be heard. I moreover note that I have discussed Scientology with the German Ambassador; the sponsors of this resolution may wish to address the accusation by the German Ambassador that they are unwilling to meet with him. Such an accusation was denied on the record at our committee markup.

Further, I note that the German Ambassador was invited by Senator D'AMATO from New York to appear or send a representative of the German Government to a hearing of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which he chairs. The German Ambassador declined because a German Government official could not in principle appear before the Commission. I will include in the RECORD a copy of Senator D'AMATO letter dated November 6, to me on this issue, and the German Ambassador's letter to me on the resolution, dated September 16, 1997.

The Department of State has worked on the problems of Scientologists and other minority religions in Germany and has done a good job in fostering the American perspective. But this dialog has gone on for some time and has had few positive results.

We hope that adopting this resolution, which has been modified considerably since its introduction, would indicate to our German friends that there is widespread support for the position that the Department has been taking and would spur a reconsideration in Germany of the policies that the resolution addresses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amended resolution.

THE AMBASSADOR OF THE
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY,
October 29, 1997.

Hon. BENJAMIN GILMAN,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you about H. Con. Res. 22 concerning alleged discrimination by the German Government against members of minority religious groups. The draft resolution I have seen contains allegations against the German federal and state governments which are entirely unfounded and absurd, and I emphatically reject them.

As you know, Germany is a free country in which religious freedom is guaranteed under the constitution and thus sacrosanct. Indeed, this fact was clearly confirmed in the latest United States Department of State Country Report on Human Rights. Furthermore, I

would like to add that no artist from the United States associated with certain religious minorities has been denied the right to perform in Germany.

I have enclosed information about the Scientology organization and the Cologne Christian Community, which speaks for itself. If you review it carefully, you will find that the German authorities have not disturbed the practice of religious freedom. Rather, on the contrary, there are increasing indications that the Scientology organization uses totalitarian and thus unconstitutional means to oppress its members and their families.

Germany is a close and trusted U.S. ally. If the current draft resolution were to come before your committee and to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote, such a move would be incomprehensible to my government, the German Parliament, and the German public. Moreover, it would be inconsistent with the excellent status of our bilateral relations and, indeed, could harm them.

I would be very grateful if you could take these concerns into account in deciding how to proceed. In the past months, I have attempted several times to arrange an appointment with the co-sponsors of an earlier draft of this resolution in order to explain the German position on the Scientology organization.

Regrettably, the Congressional members did not wish to meet with me on this matter. It therefore goes without saying that I would be happy to discuss this matter with you anytime.

I will send a copy of this letter to the House housing minority member on the International Relations Committee, Congressman Lee Hamilton.

Sincerely,

JÜRGEN CHROBOG.

NONPAPER

It cannot be said that the *Christliche Gemeinde Köln*—the Cologne Christian Community—is being persecuted or discriminated against by public institutions. Freedom of belief is fully and unconditionally guaranteed in Germany. The members of the *Christliche Gemeinde Köln* also are free to practice their belief.

NONPROFIT STATUS

As in the United States, religious communities in Germany must supply specific proof that they are nonprofit organizations in order to become tax exempt. After a thorough review of the *Christliche Gemeinde Köln*, the German tax authorities have found that the conditions under which the sect was originally recognized as a nonprofit organization no longer exist. For this reason, the *Christliche Gemeinde Köln* will be assessed from now on, as are other noncharitable organizations.

The *Christliche Gemeinde Köln* has appealed this decision. A judgment by the Tax Court is still pending in this appeal.

DISMISSALS OF MEMBERS OF THE CHRISTLICHE GEMEINDE KÖLN

The German Government does not yet have any relevant information concerning the legal background of the dismissals. It therefore cannot take a position on the discrimination charges at this time.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY
AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
November 6, 1997.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Following your Committee's mark-up of H. Con. Res. 22 concern-

ing German discrimination against individuals holding minority religions or beliefs, I noted that the German Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, Klaus Kinkel, has reportedly said that the German Ambassador to the United States, Jürgen Chrobog, has offered to explain the German position to Congress, but "... he has had no chance to do this." ("Kinkel Rejects American Critique: 'No Persecution of Religious Minorities in Germany,'" in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (National), November 3, 1997.) This assertion is false.

I have attached for your information a copy of a letter of invitation sent to Ambassador Chrobog on August 25, 1997. The relevant portion of the letter reads as follows: "I write today to invite a representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to testify at a public hearing of the Commission to be held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, September 18, 1997, in room SDG-50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The subject of the hearing will be 'Emerging Intolerance in the Federal Republic of Germany.' It will focus on official policies and actions directed at members of minority ethnic groups and minority religions and beliefs contrary to the Federal Republic's international obligations."

Commission staff engaged in repeated telephonic conversations with officials at the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany to ascertain whether the German government would provide a witness at the hearing. At no time did any German official indicate that a witness would be provided.

After reviewing the problem of religious intolerance, I decided to broaden the scope of the hearing and accordingly changed its title to "Religious Intolerance in Europe Today," so that the Commission could better address the Europe-wide nature of the problem. On September 9, 1997 my Chief of Staff sent Ambassador Chrobog's deputy, Mr. Thomas Matussek, a note explaining the change in scope and indicating that no official German witness was needed.

On September 16, 1997, Ambassador Chrobog wrote to the Commission saying that "... an official representative of Germany cannot, on principle, testify before the Commission." Since the Commission is an independent agency of the United States government, duly authorized by law, a clarification of the principle invoked by Ambassador Chrobog would be in order to determine if it would be possible for an official of the Federal Republic of Germany to speak on the record in public before any U.S. government body.

The Ambassador's letter enclosed a background paper outlining the German government's official position on the subject. By telephone, the Embassy asked that this paper be made available to Commissioners. I agreed to do that and copies of the Ambassador's letter and attached information were placed on the dais at the hearing for the use of Commissioners.

In addition, the German Embassy requested that the paper enclosed with the Ambassador's letter be included in the hearing record. I have also agreed to do that. When the hearing record is published, it will contain all of the documents I have attached to this letter.

I provide you with this detailed record of the Commission's interactions with the Federal Republic of Germany's official representatives so that you may accurately respond to the allegation that official German views have not had the opportunity to be presented to the House or Senate on this subject. The opportunity was offered, and, unlike the ambassadors and official representatives of candidate NATO member states who appeared, testified, and responded to questions at Commission hearings on that

subject during the spring of 1997, the German position was that they would not provide a witness. I have responded positively to their request that their written views be made available. In addition, staff level contacts have continued as the Commission seeks information.

Without attempting to discuss all of the problems in the official German position on this issue, I want to highlight the fact that Principle VII of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (the "Helsinki Accords," to which the Federal Republic of Germany is a party), provides, in pertinent part, that "... the participating States will recognize and respect the freedom of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience." The repeatedly asserted official German position that Scientology is not a "religion" does not meet Germany's international human rights obligations. Whether or not Scientology is a religion is irrelevant in this case, because "belief" is a broader term than "religion," and Germany's official policy toward Scientology ignores the fact that "belief" is a protected category under the Helsinki Accords. Note that Principle VII is phrased in the disjunctive, religion or belief, and that Germany's policy toward Scientology is, we believe, in violation of this critically important principle.

I appreciate this opportunity to assist you in dealing with this matter, and look forward to continuing to work with you on issues of mutual concern.

Sincerely,

ALFONSE D'AMATO, U.S.S.,
Chairman.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY
AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
August 25, 1997.

His Excellency JÜRGEN CHROBOG,
Ambassador, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I write today to invite a representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to testify at a public hearing of the Commission to be held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, September 18, 1997, in room SDG-50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The subject of the hearing will be "Emerging Intolerance in the Federal Republic of Germany." It will focus on official policies and actions directed at members of minority ethnic groups and minority religions and beliefs contrary to the Federal Republic's international obligations.

The Commission is also inviting an official witness from the Executive Branch to present the official United States position on these matters as reflected in the Department of State's "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1996," and other official statements.

While detailed plans for the hearing's organization are not yet final, I anticipate having three panels of witnesses; a first panel of official witnesses; a second panel of non-governmental organization and academic experts; and a third panel of publicly prominent Scientologists who have had experience with German policies on the Church of Scientology and its adherents. The third panel is occasioned in particular because of the Council of Ministers' decision to place the Church of Scientology "under observation" by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and coordinate state bodies.

I appreciate your kind attention to this request and express the hope that you or someone else who can speak with authority and credibility on Germany's approach to these problems can testify to present the Federal

Republic's official position with the accuracy and clarity it deserves.

In order to help Members prepare for the hearing, the Commission requests that you provide 75 copies of your written testimony at least one day prior to the hearing. Oral presentations should be approximately 7-10 minutes in length. If your desire, you may provide additional written material for inclusion in the hearing record.

I look forward to working with you on this and other issues of common concern.

Sincerely,

ALFONSE D'AMATO, U.S.S.,
Chairman.

THE AMBASSADOR OF THE
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY,
September 16, 1997.

Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO,
Chairman, *Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR D'AMATO: Thank you very much for your letter dated August 25, inviting a representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to testify at the public hearing "Emerging Intolerance in the Federal Republic of Germany," to be held by the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe on September 18. I am also aware that my deputy, Mr. Thomas Matussek, has received a letter, dated September 9, from Mr. Hathaway, Chief of Staff of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, explaining that the scope of the hearing has now been changed.

Please understand that an official representative of Germany cannot, on principle, testify before the Commission. As you may know, I have proposed on several occasions to meet individually with various Members of Congress to explain Germany's approach to the Scientology organization. While none of your colleagues expressed an interest in an exchange of views, I would be glad to renew my offer.

In the meantime, I enclose a background paper outlining the German position on the Scientology organization. The Commission staff has already been supplied with a copy.

Sincerely,

JÜRGEN CHROBOG.

SCIENTOLOGY AND GERMANY

Since October 1996 the Church of Scientology has waged an aggressive campaign against Germany. Using full-page ads in the New York Times and the Washington Post, the Scientology organization has compared the treatment of Scientologists in present-day Germany with that of the Jews under the Nazi regime. This is not only a distortion of the facts, but also an insult to the victims of the Holocaust. Officials in Germany and the U.S. have repeatedly spoken out against this blatant misuse of the Holocaust. Ignatz Bubis, Germany's top Jewish leader, denounced the comparison as "false" and most recently, State Department spokesman Nicholas Burns at a press briefing on June 6, 1997 said:

"Germany needs to be protected, the German Government and the German leadership need to be protected from this wild charge made by the Church of Scientology in the U.S. that somehow the treatment of Scientology in Germany can or should be compared to the treatment of Jews who had to live, and who ultimately perished, under Nazi rule in the 1930s. This wildly inaccurate comparison is most unfair to Chancellor Kohl and to his government and to regional governments and city governments throughout Germany. It has been made consistently by supporters of Scientology here in the United States, and by Scientologists themselves. I do want to disassociate the U.S.

Government from this campaign. We reject this campaign. It is most unfair to Germany and to Germans in general."

After having conducted thorough studies on the Scientology organization, the Federal Government has come to the conclusion that the organization's pseudo-scientific courses can seriously jeopardize individuals' mental and physical health and that it exploits its members. Expert testimony and credible reports have confirmed that membership can lead to psychological and physical dependency, to financial ruin and even to suicide.

In addition, there are indications that Scientology poses a threat to Germany's basic political principles.

Because of its experiences during the Nazi regime, Germany feels a special responsibility to monitor the development of any extreme group within its borders. German society is particularly alert towards radicalism of any kind and has set stiff standards for itself when dealing with aggressive, extreme groups—even when the groups are small in number.

Every citizen in Germany has the right to challenge the legality of government decisions which affect him or her, in an independent court. The Scientology organization has made ample use of its right to go to court in Germany and will continue to do so. Up until now, no court has found that the basic and human rights of Scientology members have been violated.

IS SCIENTOLOGY A THREAT?

According to a decision of March 22, 1995, by the Federal Labor Court, Scientology utilizes "inhuman and totalitarian practices." Often members are separated from their families and friends. The organization is structured so as to make the individual psychologically and financially dependent on a Scientology system. There are cases of the Scientology organization using this system of control and assertion of absolute authority to exercise undue influence in certain economic sectors—particularly in personnel and management training—causing serious harm to some individuals.

In response to the growing number of letters from concerned parents and family members, particularly from those with relatives in Scientology, the German Parliament (Bundestag) established an investigative commission which will present a report on the activities of "sects and psychocults" in the course of the year 1997.

In the United States, two legal cases involving Scientology support the German Federal Government's concerns about the organization. In the early 1980s, 11 top Scientologists were convicted in the United States for plotting to plant spies in federal agencies, break into government offices and bug at least one IRS meeting. Referring to Scientology's battle with the IRS for tax-exempt status, The New York Times in a front-page article published March 9, 1997 "found that the (tax) exemption followed a series of unusual internal IRS actions that came after an extraordinary campaign orchestrated by Scientology against the agency and people who work there. Among the findings . . . were these: Scientology's lawyers hired private investigators to dig into the private lives of IRS officials and to conduct surveillance operations to uncover potential vulnerabilities." In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a California court's finding of substantial evidence that Scientology practices took place in a coercive environment and rejected Scientology's claims that the practices were protected under religious freedom guaranties.

In other countries, too, the Scientology organization is increasingly seen with great concern. In France, a government commis-

sion led by Prime Minister Juppé, and charged with monitoring the activities of sects, convened its first meeting in mid-November 1996. On November 22, 1996, in Lyon, several leading Scientologists were found guilty of involuntary manslaughter and fraud in a case where methods taught by Scientology were found to have driven a person to suicide.

In Italy during December 1996, an Italian court ordered jail terms for 29 Scientologists found guilty of "criminal association."

In Greece, a judge declared in January 1997 that an Athens Scientology group was illegal after ruling that the group had used false pretenses to obtain an operating license.

IS SCIENTOLOGY A BONA-FIDE RELIGION?

In its ads and writings, the Scientology organization claims it is internationally recognized as a religion, except in Germany. This is false.

Among the countries that do not consider Scientology a religion are Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, and Spain, as well as Israel and Mexico.

In the United States, the Scientology organization did in fact receive tax-exempt status as a religious congregation in 1993—after a decades-long, contentious battle with the IRS.

In Germany, it is possible for organizations undertaking non-profit activities to be exempt from taxation. Up until now, attempts by the Scientology organization to obtain such status have failed. Two of the highest German courts recently dealt with cases involving the Scientology organization. The Federal Labor Court (Bundesarbeitsgericht) in its above mentioned decision on March 22, 1995, also ruled, that the Scientology branch in Hamburg was not a religious congregation, but clearly a commercial enterprise. In its decision, the court quotes one of L. Ron Hubbard's instructions "make money, make more money—make other people produce so as to make money" and concludes that Scientology purports to be a "church" merely as a cover to pursue its economic interests.

The Federal Administrative Court (Bundesverwaltungsgericht) confirmed decisions by lower administrative courts that the Scientology organization has to register its economic activities as a business with the relevant authorities (decision of February 16, 1995).

Also in France, the Scientology organization is neither a religion nor a non-profit institution. The organization's Paris head office was closed in early 1996 for not paying back taxes.

In Great Britain, the Scientology organization has been rebuffed repeatedly by the Charity Commission which insisted as recently as 1995 that the organization could not be considered a religion under British law and could, therefore, not enjoy any tax-exempt status.

FEDERAL AND REGIONAL ACTION TAKEN AGAINST THE SCIENTOLOGISTS IN GERMANY

On June 6, 1997, Federal and State Ministers of the Interior agreed to place the Scientology organization under surveillance. The Ministers have established that several activities of the Scientology organization may operate contrary to democratic principles and therefore warrants a formal investigation by the Office for the Protection of the Constitution (Verfassungsschutz). The investigation will focus on the structure of the organization and not on individual members. Concrete details regarding the extent of the investigation are not available at this time, but more information will be disclosed following the investigation's first year. Referring to the investigation, Manfred Kanther,

Federal Minister of the Interior, said on June 6, 1997: "The year's surveillance will establish whether the organization is simply an unpleasant group, a criminal organization or an association with anti-constitutional aims."

Some of the German states have taken steps to protect their citizens against Scientology:

As of November 1, 1996, all applicants for admission to Bavarian public service and Bavarian public service employees must indicate whether they belong to the Scientology organization. Membership in Scientology alone does not automatically exclude individuals from public service.

THE SCIENTOLOGY PUBLIC RELATIONS CAMPAIGN
AGAINST GERMANY

The Scientology organization has financed several highly visible public relations campaigns directed against the Federal Republic of Germany in American publications. Among the papers that have carried full-page ads in the last couple of years are the New York Times, the Washington Post and the International Herald Tribune. In addition, the International Herald Tribune published a controversial open letter to German Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

The Scientology organization has also distributed pamphlets such as "The Rise of Hatred and Violence in Germany," reiterating its allegations.

The open letter to Chancellor Kohl, written by a Hollywood lawyer with famous Scientology clients, appeared in early 1997 in the International Herald Tribune. The letter repeated Scientology organization assertions against Germany and was signed by 34 American celebrities. "Disgraceful and irresponsible" is how Michel Friedman, a member of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, described the letter. He added: "It's totally off the mark. Today, we have a democracy and a state based on the rule of law."

Following the letter, the U.S. State Department again criticized the Scientologists' public relations campaign, saying, "we have advised the Scientology community not to run those ads because the German government is a democratic government and it governs a free people. And it is simply outrageous to compare the current Germany leadership to the Nazi-era leadership. We've told the Scientologists this, and in this sense we share the outrage of many Germans to see their government compared to the Nazis."

ARE THE CASES IN THE ADS TRUE?

The Scientologists' repeated allegations that artists belonging to Scientology are being discriminated against in Germany are false. Freedom of artistic expression is guaranteed in Article 5(3) of the German Basic Law (Germany's Constitution), thus artists are free to perform or exhibit in Germany anywhere they please.

Jazz pianist Chick Corea performed in Germany as recently as March 24, 1996, during the 27th International Jazz Week held in Burghausen, an event which received approximately \$10,000 in funding from the Bavarian Ministry of Culture.

"Mission Impossible," starring Tom Cruise, was a hit in Germany, grossing \$23.6 million.

Likewise, the Scientologists' claim that a teacher who taught near the city of Hannover was fired for her beliefs is untrue. The woman was not fired, though she repeatedly violated school regulations by using the classroom to recruit students and their parents to Scientology. After multiple warnings, the woman was transferred from classroom to administrative duties to prevent further violations.

Contrary to allegations that Scientologists' children have been prevented

from attending school, all children in Germany, including Scientologists', are legally required to attend school. If a Scientologist's child is not enrolled in a German school, it can only be that the parent has pulled the child out.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in strong opposition to the legislation.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation came to the House Committee on International Relations with very little notice. It was on the agenda one morning. We have no Europe and Middle East subcommittee, and this legislation is one more argument why we should have so that bad and defective legislation, which in my judgment this is, can be vetted by the subcommittee, reworked, or stopped at that point before it comes to the House floor.

I think this legislation, if the Members of the body were fully familiar with it, would be voted down. We are taking it up in the last hours of the Congress. I am very concerned about the kind of message that it will send.

What we do on this body does matter when it comes to statements on foreign policy. We may consider it to be a very lightly relevant issue at times. But I will tell my colleagues, across the oceans when other countries look at what we do, they take it very seriously. So we have to be very careful.

The Ambassador from Germany to the United States has weighed in with about as strong a letter as I have seen, refuting some of the arguments that have been made by proponents of the legislation. He contends he did not have an opportunity to meet with the Members who were sponsoring it. That has been argued about in the committee, as I understand it.

But I think one important point would be this: This comes down, as I understand it, to a matter of taxation with respect to what we would say in English would be the Cologne Christian community, because they, in Germany, do not consider Scientology to be a religion. Therefore, they tax it. But Germany is not alone in that respect. So does Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain, and Europe, plus Israel and Mexico. And those are just the countries that I know about.

So it seems to me to bring this legislation here aiming it at Germany, which was at first at least almost exclusively a Scientology-oriented legislation, now been broadened with an amendment to change it, I think is inappropriate. It is unbalanced. It is damaging to our relations with Germany. And there is no real cause for us to be considering this kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of this bill expressing disapproval of religious discrimination by the German Government, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined in supporting a very basic, democratic right, freedom of religion.

This bipartisan resolution was approved by the full Committee on International Relations after performing artists associated with religious minorities were denied the opportunity to perform in Germany and were also kept out of the political process. As our resolution states, the German Government is constitutionally obligated to remain neutral on religious matters, but it has violated this neutrality.

The United States, as the leader of the free world and champion of democracy around the globe, has an obligation to take a stand whenever we see basic religious rights being restricted, whether their religious affiliation is Muslim, Christian, Jewish, or any other faith. Performing artists from the United States have been denied the right to perform in Germany based on their personal spiritual beliefs.

When our citizens visit and work abroad, they should be able to live in peace without the fear of religious intolerance or mistreatment by the host government. In turn, when individuals visit the United States or decide to live here, they have a right to be able to worship freely and join any organization or group they choose to. These are good-faith gestures. Discrimination against a person because of his or her personal beliefs is always objectionable.

Congress should stand up and say that we strongly disprove of religious intolerance. Germany is a friend, has been a friend for some time, an ally of the United States, and we want that relationship to remain strong and mutually beneficial. That is why we are calling on the German Government to respect the fundamental rights of every citizen of a democracy, the right to enjoy religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. This resolution was acted upon without a public hearing and without a committee report and should, at the very least, be further considered by the committee. The sweeping allegations in the resolution are based upon a handful of alleged events that in no way support the allegations. This is serious business.

Germany is one of our Nation's staunchest and most dependable allies. The only purpose this resolution will serve is to create ill will and less friendly relations with a steadfast

friend. America needs the full and enthusiastic support of strong and dependable nations like Germany. If it is to be successful in carrying out its mandate of world leadership, we should not be petty and elevate every issue to embarrassing confrontation.

When folks on one side of the street start throwing rocks, it is not long before folks on the other side start throwing them back. This resolution is bad for our country. I urge Members to reject it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time we have consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has 16½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], a member of our committee.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful opportunity for us to reaffirm what we stand for here in this country, whether or not we stand for the ability of Americans, wherever they live, whether it be in this country, whether it be Germany, Italy, wherever, to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience.

I have heard my colleagues say that this was not given an adequate hearing. Let me tell them that I serve on the committee dealing with security and cooperation in Eastern Europe. We had a full day of testimony and hearings regarding incident after incident of persecution in Germany of minority religions.

I have heard it also referred to as the Scientology bill. Let me tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, it is much broader than that. I had folks from the Jehovah's Witness religion, folks from other Christian religions, Muslims, come into my office and tell me some of the horrors that they have had to endure regarding religious persecution in Germany. It is much more than just a taxation issue.

□ 1745

When we talk about American citizens being blacklisted or blackballed and boycotted simply because of their religion, not allowed to go abroad and perform simply because of their religious persuasion, that is something that ought to give us great concern. Furthermore, I have heard some of my colleagues on this floor in a whisper, I do not think anybody wants to go forth publicly and say anything this ludicrous, but I have heard some Members say behind the scenes, "Wait a minute, this is Scientology, they aren't Christian, or they aren't one of the mainstream religions." I doubt anybody would say something that foolish in the light of day because frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is what this country began about, it was about religious

freedom, religious tolerance. That is why a band of people came to this country initially, so that they could flee religious persecution. If we do not stand for the protection of that, regardless of whether or not it is a minority religion, then we stand for nothing. Let me also point out that virtually every religion, yes, even Christianity, which I am proud to be a believer in, started as a minority religion.

From that time on, people were persecuted for their beliefs. Whether they are killed, whether they are blackballed, whether they are thrown out of the country, whatever persecution exists, we have a responsibility in our Government to stand up and be counted. If we cannot do that, if we cannot speak harshly to our allies who are our friends, if we cannot be plain spoken and honest with them, how can we be plain spoken and honest with our enemies?

Last week we debated 8 bills decrying China for its violations on human rights. I have heard some say that, "Gosh, we didn't have any officials from Germany come and testify before our committee. Therefore, how can we give this serious credence?" I have served on the Committee on International Relations for 3 years and I do not recall a public official from any of the governments that we have done resolutions on ever coming in and testifying before that committee.

Frankly, this is all a smoke screen. Let us stand up and be counted. Let us stand for what we profess to believe in, that is, religious tolerance.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, just for clarification I would indicate that the Committee on International Relations did not have hearings on this. The Helsinki Commission organization in this body did, but not the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], a member of the committee.

(Mr. CAMPBELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, how quick we are to condemn and how quick we are to neglect the advice of scripture to be sure about what may be in our own eye before we go and criticize what we find in another's. But this is particularly difficult when the criticism is against a friend and when we have not given that friend the opportunity to be heard.

Let me be very explicit. We, the House of Representatives, the Committee on International Relations, has not given Germany the opportunity to be heard. There is an allegation that Senator D'AMATO might have invited German witnesses, they might have refused. I understand that is a give and take in that particular context. I understand that at one point Senator D'AMATO's chief of staff said that a German witness was not going to be

needed after all. But the point about our committee and our House is that we are today condemning a friend, an ally of the United States and we have not had the common courtesy to ask Germany to send a representative to our committee to answer the charges. That is no way to treat a friend and ally.

These are very strong charges. Let me quote from the resolution. We believe that Germany has "fostered an atmosphere of intolerance toward certain minority religious groups."

Given the history of Germany, these are very painful words. These are words that we should not be saying lightly. Yet we do without having heard from our friends. We claim that the German Government has engaged in discrimination and we use the word several times in the resolution.

First of all, the pain and the process are emphasized in my remarks, the pain that we inflict on a friend and the imprecision of the process. But note as well that this really does not deal with the high concerns that the sponsors wish to suggest. It seems to concern itself at least as much with tax-exempt status in Germany, as to which we would not welcome German interference in our country.

I conclude by saying this: To the German Government and to our friends around the world who watch what we do today, please understand this is not the overwhelming majority. Understand what we do today in the final minutes of a session coming to a conclusion is not the thoughtful expression of a majority of this House, in my view. It was a voice vote in the committee. It will probably be a voice vote again. Please note that we are not addressing you in the terms that this resolution appears to say, that we are better friends than that.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

(Mr. BECERRA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 22 is about preserving religious freedom, plain and simple. I learned the depth of this problem when I was introduced to the hardships faced by scientologists in Germany. Early in my congressional career about 5 years ago, I met with Chick Corea the renowned jazz pianist and learned that he had been barred from public performances in Germany. He was set to go, he had performances all lined up. All of a sudden he was not granted a visa to go into Germany even though most of his performances had already been for the most part sold out. At the time I was able to work with a number of my colleagues and we put letters together and sent them off to the German government protesting such actions.

Back in 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in the future days which

we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon 4 essential human freedoms. Those freedoms he listed were freedom of speech, of expression, of being free from want, and freedom from fear. He also told us of the freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world. I mention that because just yesterday, if Members read the New York Times, there was an article that said a Federal immigration court judge in Tampa, Florida, granted asylum to a German citizen who was a member of the Church of Scientology. Her asylum claim was based on the fact that she would be subjected to religious persecution had she returned to Germany.

Many of my constituents, as I suspect many of your constituents, are members of religious minority groups like the Church of Scientology. This resolution calls for protecting their rights if and when they spend time in Germany. They deserve this protection. German citizens themselves who are members of minority religious groups deserve religious freedom as well.

As Members cast their vote on House Concurrent Resolution 22, remember the words of President Roosevelt listing religious freedom as one of the four essential human freedoms. As he said, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world. Today is one of those future days that President Roosevelt spoke of. Today we should be standing together to say aye to House Concurrent Resolution 22.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a member of the committee.

(Mr. HOUGHTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I feel very uncomfortable supporting this measure. I do not know whether the actions of the German Government in relationship to the Church of Scientology are right or wrong. I have a sense, and this is probably presumptuous for me to say, had I been given the decision to make, I might have made it a little differently. But that is not the issue. The issue is whether we do not look just a bit pompous sitting back here with all our many moral problems in this country, to pass judgment on a nation, our friend, which is wrestling with something which we ourselves and other nations of this world are wrestling with. This is not a Martin Niemoller issue. Please let us withhold judgment. I would not support this measure.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER].

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, as amended, and ask for bipartisan support. This issue is something pretty basic for all

Americans, about basic American principles and values of freedom and religion. I think we all wonder sometimes and think back to why the Founding Fathers and Mothers came to our Nation. One of the reasons was and is because we practice tolerance and freedom of religion, and they came here, our ancestors, to avoid religious persecution. It is a pretty basic value for all of us. Germany is our ally. It is a first world country. It should be leading the way in religious tolerance. But unfortunately, American citizens today are being denied the ability to do business in Germany because of their religious faith. Whether Members agree with the values and the teachings of Islam, or Jehovah's Witnesses, or Charismatic Christians or the Church of Scientology, these individuals are being persecuted today. That is why this resolution is important. The President should be discussing this issue because he should be speaking in behalf of Americans who are suffering persecution. Congress must speak. I ask for bipartisan support. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. If there is discrimination then it should be pointed out, but it should be pointed out in all the places it might occur. But here efforts are being made to single out Germany. I rise in opposition because there are differing views about some of the specific allegations. One of the performers that has been mentioned here has played in Germany as recently as last year at a function that received funding from the State of Bavaria. The movies that have supposedly been boycotted indeed have been shown and have been hits in Germany, financial successes.

I rise in opposition because if we are talking about the Church of Scientology. Our own country did not grant tax-exempt status to that church until 1993. Indeed, there is a long list of nations, Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Spain that presently decline to grant that same status.

I rise in opposition because France, Italy, and Greece recently have taken actions which could be considered as discrimination in the sense they had made rulings against this Church of Scientology, and yet this resolution does not mention them.

Finally, because in a statement by Michael Friedman of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, responding to many of the charges made, he writes, "They are totally off the mark. Today we have a democracy in Germany and a state based on rule of law."

The sponsors have heightened awareness about alleged discrimination in many places, but let us not single out an ally with relatively unsubstantiated charges. Instead, let us engage and talk to each other as the true friends we

are. There are American men and women in Bosnia today side by side with German men and women holding up an important part of our European responsibilities. Germany works with us in so many different ways. Let us recognize that and vote this resolution down, at the same time urging that discrimination everywhere be pointed out and that we deal with it together.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for religious freedom and ask my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 22.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 22, which declares that the Congress holds Germany responsible for protecting the rights of United States citizens who are living, doing business, or traveling in Germany and deplors the actions of certain government officials in Germany which have fostered an atmosphere of intolerance toward certain minority religious groups.

This country was founded on the principles of freedom of religion, and in over 200 years of history we have not only survived but thrived.

This resolutions calls for the President to assert the concern of the United States Government against such discrimination; to emphasize that the United States regards the human rights practices of the German Government as a significant factor in the relationship between the two countries; and to encourage other governments to appeal to the Government of Germany in efforts to protect the rights of foreign citizens and members of minority religious groups in Germany.

Germany is a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Helsinki accords, and is therefore obliged to refrain from religious discrimination and to foster a climate of tolerance.

It is important for the Congress to make its views known with regards to human rights by our adversaries, but especially by our allies. Religious freedom should be a basic right of all people regardless of their faith or nationality.

I would hope that the people of Germany will take note of the peaceful diverse religious community that exists here in this country and would reframe from discouraging religious diversity in their own nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

(Mr. PASTOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this Congress in October of 1991, I was approached about trying to do something with this issue. I have to tell Members since then to today, things have gotten worse for the people

not only who are in Germany but also for the Americans that travel to Germany.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is, if you are for human rights, you should be for this resolution. If you are against religious persecution, you should be for this resolution. If you are against the persecution of Christians in China, you should be for this resolution. Mr. Speaker, there is concern for many of us in this country and we are supporting this resolution in a bilingual nature, because we want to show our concern that we do not want history to repeat itself in Germany.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 9 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled and puzzled and disappointed that the House tonight has decided to take up this resolution with regard to the Church of Scientology in Germany when the House has decided not to bring up the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act, a bill that I sponsored along with 96 other Members of the House. While we are debating this resolution tonight, millions of Christians in Tibet, Buddhists in Tibet, Buddhists, Ahmadis in other countries, the Bahai's in Iran, Muslims in China and people of other faiths are being brutalized, killed, raped, tortured and maimed because of their beliefs, and yet the House does not deal with this issue and they deal with this issue with regard to this resolution.

□ 1800

There is real life slavery. In Sudan tonight they are going into slave markets and taking people out, and the House does not deal with that issue, but yet it deals with this issue.

In Egypt Coptic Christians are being persecuted today as we now speak. The House does not deal with that issue, but it deals with this issue.

In closing, I am troubled and puzzled and very disappointed. If we are going to take up this resolution tonight, we basically are saying these other issues should be taken care of, and they are not being taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, I am troubled and disappointed that the House of Representatives has decided to take up the resolution on the Scientologists in Germany when the House has decided not to bring up the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act, a bill I sponsored with Senator ARLEN SPECTER.

The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act has over 96 bipartisan cosponsors and deals with persecution against people of all faiths in all countries around the world.

While we are debating this resolution today, millions of Christians, Tibetan Buddhists, Ahmadis, Bahai's, Muslims and other people of faith are being brutalized—killed, raped, tortured, and maimed—because of their religious belief and practice. Why won't the House speak out for them in this first session of the 105th Congress.

In China, Catholic bishops and priests are in jail and being tortured. Protestant pastors and laypeople are in jail and being tortured. Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns are in jail and being tortured and killed. In Xinjiang Province in Northwest China, Muslim Uighurs are being persecuted.

In Sudan, 1.2 million people from the South, who are predominately Christians and animists, have died in the decade-old conflict. There is crucifixion taking place in the Nuba Mountains. Christian women and children are kidnapped and sold into slavery.

I have submitted for the record excerpts from a recent trip report of Christian Solidarity International, an international humanitarian organization with vast experience in Sudan. On their recent trip, CSI representative talked to dozens of women and children and heard of their ordeal. They talked with slave traders and visited slave markets.

One woman, a 20-year old mother, told of her ordeal when she was enslaved in May, 1997. She told CSI

I was sitting in my compound early in the morning when armed men on horseback surrounded my home. They came without warning. I did not try to run away because there was no escape. One of the raiders lashed me and took me away with my child. As we left, I could see the raiders looting everything I owned, and setting my home on fire. I was taken to another village for some hours and was then forced to carry sorghum on my head. When I could walk no further, my captor, took my child and tied her on a horse. [My captor] often insulted me, calling me "slave" and he would beat me with a stick. He accused me of being lazy and refusing to obey orders. He used me as a concubine.

Real life slavery of Christians in Sudan. 1.2 million people have died. But the House of Representatives will not speak out for them today.

In Egypt, Coptic Christians are killed, forced to pay "protection money" to local thugs, harassed and sometimes imprisoned.

In Pakistan, Christian villages have been burned, devastating the lives of tens of thousands. Ahmadi Muslims are being persecuted.

In Vietnam, Christians and Buddhists are being persecuted.

And there are many other examples around the world. Why will this Congress not take up the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act—a bill that would cut off foreign aid to governments that kill, rape, torture, enslave or engage in other gross acts of violence against religious believers. We should speak out for these religious believers today.

There was a promise by the speaker to 40 religious leaders in August that the bill would be a "must do" item. He said "this is one of the top priorities of this Republican Congress."

Why take up this resolution to help Scientologists in Germany, but not bring up a bill that would help millions of people of faith in dozens of other countries around the world?

The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act is supported by the groups representing the vast majority of America's religious believers. It is supported by the Southern Baptist Convention, the National Association of Evangelicals, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the U.S. Catholic Bishop's Conference and the International Campaign for Tibet among others.

It is also supported by the American Coptic Association, the Assyrian National Congress, the Catholic Alliance, Christian Coalition, Evangelicals for Social Action, Family Research Council, Iranian Christians International, National Jewish Coalition, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Pakistani-American Christian Association, World Lebanese Organization, World Maronite Union-USA, and the South Sudan Community of the U.S.

In May, over 90 religious leaders wrote to House leadership endorsing the measure and I submit that letter in the record. I also submit recent letters from the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference and Rabbi David Saperstein, Director of the Religious Action Center for Reform Judaism in support of the bill.

When he met with the religious leaders in August, Speaker Gingrich said "As Speaker of the House, I will continue to use my bully pulpit to speak out for those who are unable to speak for themselves." Mr. Speaker, please use that bully pulpit and your extraordinary power as Speaker of the House to bring up the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act early in the next session.

It's puzzling and it's disappointing that this resolution is being brought up but the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act is not.

DRAFT PRELIMINARY REPORT: VISIT TO NORTH-EASTERN BAHR EL GHAZAL, SUDAN

OCTOBER 8-12, 1997

Slavery in Sudan

The primary objective of this visit was to develop CSI's work to combat contemporary slavery in Sudan.

CSI had received various unconfirmed reports of the practice of slavery on early visits to Sudan. But it was not until we visited Nyamlell in Aweil West County briefly in May 1995 that we discovered slavery as a flourishing and widespread institution. We learnt that on March 25 1995 the Popular Defense Forces (PDF) of Sudan's ruling National Islamic Front (NIF) regime attacked Nyamlell, killing 82 civilians, enslaving 282 women and children; burning dwellings and looting cattle and grain.

Since then, CSI has returned 8 times to this area and has visited other locations in northern Bahr El Ghazal, such as Malwal Akon in Aweil East County and Turalei in Gogrial County, to obtain further data on slavery. During these fact-finding missions, we have interviewed slaves, slave traders, PDF officers and the families of people who are still enslaved. We have accumulated an abundance of evidence to prove beyond doubt that chattel slavery thrives in these parts of Sudan and that the NIF regime actively encourages it. See reports of CSI visits to Sudan: May-June 1995; August 1995; October 1995; April-May 1996; June 1996, October-November 1996, March 1997 and June 1997. The evidence obtained during this visit amplifies our previous findings about the pattern of the slave trade.

Interviews with some of the newly redeemed slaves give an indication of their experiences during enslavement.

(i) Ayen Deng Ding from Akek Rot near Marial Bai. Her village was attacked 4 years

ago. When the raiders came, she was in her home with her 10-year old daughter Ajok Garang. She saw the horses coming and started to run but she and her little girl were caught by a horseman. She was beaten (she showed us scars on her arms), tied with a rope and taken North to Abu Matarik, where she was handed over to another man. She was separated from her daughter, but they were nearby. When the trader came to negotiate her release, she told him about her daughter and he managed to secure her release also.

During her 4 years of slavery, she was treated very badly: subjected to beatings while caring for the cattle; she also had to cook, fetch water, carry firewood, wash clothes and work in the garden. She was not given enough food—only leftovers—and was constantly hungry.

She saw other slaves being beaten, 4 of whom died—3 men and 1 woman. She was raped repeatedly on the forced march north, but her owner only raped her once.

I lost hope I would ever see my home again, but I just prayed to God. I was so happy when I saw the trader coming, I began to dare to hope. But many other slaves are still left behind.

She now has only her daughter left; her husband was killed in the raid. She has gone to live with relatives, but she also lives with the fear that the raiders will come again. She asked us to convey this message:

We are so happy now we are feeling free. Thank you for what you have done for us. The problem remains and there are still people left behind as slaves, but we are comforted because when we saw you we felt you care for us very much. When we arrived here, we were so relieved and happy we had could meet in a secure environment, to engage in politically legitimate activities which are banned by the NIF in the North.

Expectations had been raised during previous visits of Umma Party representatives and disappointment was expressed over the delay in fulfilling them.

Several more Arabs expressed similar sentiments, which can be summarized in the words of two of their spokesmen:

We are the supporters of the Umma Party. We are Ansars, not NIF. We are rivals of the NIF, but the leaders of the Umma Party have been unseen and unheard for a long time. This has enabled the NIF to recruit our people.

NIF Recruitment Policies: Another spokesman claimed that the training and arming of Arab citizens by the NIF over 4 or 5 years has been very intensive. But after receiving the messages from the Umma Party leadership, this has slowed down, although there are still bad elements in society who are tempted by greed still to participate in the raids. Because of their difficulty in recruiting raiders, the NIF are now recruiting school children from about 15 years of age to fight in the PDF. So-called "co-ordinators" from the regular Army are used to round up children from schools. There are many children now at the military headquarters at Daien. Airplanes come to take the children away and they are never seen again. All tribes in Darfur are affected. It is Omer El Bashir who gives orders for the rounding up of children. The ones who actually do it are the Security forces and the police, but they are just obeying orders.

Living Conditions in Darfur: These are very, very bad in Nyala, Daien and other towns. We have no choice but to migrate. Nomads and everyone else are badly affected. A 20-litre barrel of fresh drinking water is £3,000 (Sudanese pounds), a portion of bread is £250 (SP), 2cc of penicillin cost £4,000 (SP), while the maximum pay a labourer or clerk is £20–25,000 (SP) per month. A consultation

with a doctor, just for diagnoses, not for treatment costs £20,000 (SP).

Here is proof that life in Darfur is unbearable: I am an old man and I had to walk through water for 7 days carrying heavy loads to trade with the Dinka—this shows just how bad conditions are in Darfur.

The meeting concluded with a final message from Ali Mahmoud Duedein: Recruitment to the PDF has diminished, because of CSI's work to promote peace and reconciliation. The NIF can still recruit, but not like before.

We camped overnight at Manyiel.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10

We walked on from Manyiel to Majak Bai, the village we visited in June, shortly after it had suffered from a major raid (CSI field trip report of June 1997). During that raid, the school was burnt to the ground. On this occasion we met the headteacher again, Aguek Manjok. He described the situation: there had been 300 children in the school but some disappeared as a result of the raid. During the attack, everything was burnt: the building, all the books and every piece of equipment: there was absolutely nothing left.

They now urgently need teaching resources for their curriculum of English, Maths, Geography, History, Science, Hygiene and Religious Education, with text books to cover levels P1-8. At present, he said, we can only teach what is in our minds and that is not enough.

There is also a need for help to send people for teacher training. There is a centre for Aweil West County in Majong Akon.

NB. The need for professional education/updating was repeated many times. One specific request, which we would support, was made by Simon Kuot, the nurse/medical co-ordinator based at Nyamlell. We have seen him at work and been very impressed by the standard of professional competence he displays (e.g. treating the serious casualties from the raids). His area of responsibility is very large and makes many professional demands. We hope it will be possible for to dance. Although we were beaten and humiliated and though there are still problems here, like shortages of medicines, these are not real problems—we can cope with those. We are so happy to be back.

(i) Abuk Atak from Panlang near Marial Bai. 3 years ago her village was attacked and she was beaten by an Arab with a gun during the raid. She had her 18-month old daughter with her, but lost her in the raid and has never seen her again. After being taken North, she was sold to Anur Mohammed in Abu Matarik in Southern Darfur. She was raped every day, sometimes many times, by different people; if she did not submit voluntarily, she was beaten. Clearly embarrassed by talking about her ordeals, fidgeting anxiously with dead leaves, she said she had been subjected to circumcision. But she would talk about it because "I can't deny the facts. We were subjected to torture and suffering and I can't deny our humiliation."

She never thought she would be able to come home again and during those 3 years she lost all hope. But now she is home, she said: We were left with nothing after the raids; we lost our homes, our crops were burnt, our cattle stolen, we have not even any clothes . . . but there is no problem which we cannot endure.

(iii) Acol Bak, aged 12 from Panlang, who assured us at the outset that she was not afraid to talk about her experiences. 4 years ago she was at home in the early morning; Arabs suddenly appeared and she was surrounded by horses. He mother managed to escape but she and her elder brother were caught and taken to Gross near Abu

Matarik. She doesn't know what happened to her brother. On the walk North she was forced to carry looted property on her head; they were given no water and could only drink from muddy puddles; neither were they given any food during the 3-day forced march. She was beaten and her right arm was broken. She was forced to do housework from morning until night and beaten by all the family if she ever complained of tiredness. She had to sleep outside with no bedding, just trying to keep warm by a fire. One month after her arrival in her owner's home, an old woman came to circumcise her. She was told that unless she was circumcised she would not be a human being; she would be just "like a dog". She knew other girls who had also been circumcised.

She said she was very, very happy to be home again and for the people who brought her back. She is living only with her mother as her father had been killed in the raid and her brother has not been found.

(iv) Acol Anei Bak from Panlang was caught by surprise when the enemy attacked her village 4 years ago, when she was about 8 years old. Her brother, aged about 12, was caught at the same time and she does not know what happened to him. She was taken to Pielel, near Nyala, where she was sold to a man called Amsal Abrahaman. She was forced to help to care for the 5 children in the family, especially with washing them, and to look after cattle and horses. The children were very unfriendly and would not speak to her. She was circumcised, and told that this was being done to her because the owner wanted her to be an Arab.

(v) Ayen Ding Yel from Akek Rot near Marial Bai was captured in May this year. She showed us her foot which was injured when a horse trod on it during the raid; she was also shot and showed us the scar caused by the bullet which injured her left knee. She was initially left behind, after she was injured, but then another Arab put her on his horse and took her to Abu Matarik. She was badly treated and beaten whenever she asked for food. Her owner asked her why she needed food—saying she did not deserve food. She said she never dreamt that she would be free again and that her mother was overjoyed to see her yesterday.

(vi) Nyibol Yel Akuei is a 20-year old mother. Three of her children have starved to death. Her only surviving child is a one-year-old daughter, Abuk. The mother and daughter were enslaved during the PDF raid on Majak Bai on May 16, 1997. Nyibol explained what had happened to them: I was sitting in my compound early in the morning when armed men on horseback surrounded my home. They came without any warning. I did not try to run away because there was no escape. One of the raiders lashed me and took me away with my child. As we left, I could see the raiders looting everything I owned, and setting my home on fire. I was taken to another village for some hours and then was forced to carry sorghum on my head. When I got tired and could not walk further, my captor, Mahmoud Abaker, took my child and tied her on a horse. I walked for seven days to Abu Matarik. There, I had to work from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 pm. My jobs were to carry water from the pump, clean the compound and wash clothing. Mahoud Abaker often insulted me, calling me "slave" and he would beat me with a stick. He accused me of being lazy and refusing to obey orders. He also used me as a concubine. Mahmoud Abaker told me that I should practice Muslim prayers. I had trouble praying in Arabic, so they gave me some training. Abuk was renamed Miriam. I was not allowed to go far from the compound. Mahmoud Abaker may have had other slaves at his cattle camp, but I never saw them. He had no other slaves in the

compound. One day, I was told to leave the compound with a trader. I was afraid to go. They told me I would go back to southern Sudan. I didn't believe them, but went anyway. I was very happy to see you and to find that you spoke nicely to us and are not going to do something terrible to us. My husband is now away trying to find food. When he comes back we will find a new place to live.

(vii) 11-year-old War Weng is also from Majak Bai. He was enslaved in 1994 when he was fishing with his father. A group of raiders came and snatched him, while his father managed to run away. He recalled his life as both the chattel slave of a master and a inmate in a radical Islamic youth indoctrination centre: I was taken to Daien by Musa Osman. My jobs there were to clear cattle dung and take the calves to the river. I received only left-overs to eat and sour milk to drink. After a year or so, I was taken from Musa Osman to a big camp in the town where you can see the light even at night. There were big lights over the compound. There were a lot of boys in this compound. All of them were Dinka boys. We all were given uniforms. This compound was run by the Salsabil organisation. (War Weng was wearing a uniform with the Salsabil logo). Every morning we would wake up early and gather in one place to pray. Then we were taught the Koran for the rest of the morning. At about mid-day we were given food and allowed to rest. From 3:00 until the evening there was more learning. The most important teacher there was Abdel Rahman. None of us were allowed to speak Dinka. We had to speak Arabic all the time. I was beaten for speaking Dinka with my friends. One day, one of the teachers told me and three others to go to the river with a man and his horses. I thought he was going to take us to a new master. Instead he brought us back home. I did not like the camp. It is very good to be back here. Now I am not beaten. I expect to go back to my father. He has already visited me one and given me some food.

(viii) Atoc Diling is about 11 or 12 years old. She was enslaved during the raid on Majak Bai last May. She recounted:

We heard gunfire early in the morning. My Mother said run quickly. We ran towards the river. When we got there, we found Arabs all around us. We couldn't run anymore. My Mother stopped and started to cry. One of the raiders came towards us and beat my mother. She fell down. I was taken away and put on horseback. I was taken from place to place before we reached Abu Matarik. There, my captor, Ali Abdullah sold be to another. After four days, I was sold again to another man. His name was Mohammed. He took me to his home in the small village of Gumbilai, near Abu Matarik. I had to fetch water and firewood, and clean. They gave me milk to drink everyday, but some days they gave me no food at all. The young sons of Mohammed were very rough with me. They would beat me, and they tried to have sex with me. But they did not succeed. Mohammed has many slaves. Most of them were in the cattle camp. He has three female slaves at his house. Now that I am back, I will go to live with my sister. My father is dead, and my mother went North to look for me and has not yet returned.

Interview with casualty of the PDF's May 1997 raid on Majak Bai, the 28-year-old mother, Adel Lake. She was evacuated by CSI to the ICRC hospital in Lokichokio in Kenya last June. The ICRC was not able to evacuate her because the NIF regime has suspended its operations inside Sudan since November 1996. This has meant that thousands of casualties have died slowly, painfully and needlessly from easily treatable wounds. Adel Lake returned to Bahr El Ghazal with her health restored while we were there. She told us:

When the enemy came we were in our tukul. We heard gunshots. I picked up my twin one-month-old babies and ran away to hide. I could not also carry by three-year-old son, Wek Wol, and he was left behind. I hid in the bushes together with my sister-in-law and some other people. The Arab soldiers spotted us and started firing their guns. Everything was in a mess and confused. I was show in the leg and lost consciousness. When I regained consciousness, I could not walk. The bullet had badly fractured my thigh. I was horrified to find that my tukul had been burnt down, and that my son, who had remained inside, had been burnt alive. I also discovered that my sister-in-law had been shot dead. I was weak and sick for many weeks after being shot. I was in a lot of pain and could not look after my babies by myself. I did not believe that help would come. I thought I would never get better. When you came and found me in my bed I felt very happy and believed that you would do something to help me. At the hospital, they made my leg better. The wound and fracture is healed, but I still feel some pain. Please give my greetings to all of those who helped me.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11, DEPARTED NYAMLELL AND ARRIVED IN MALWAL AKON; INTERVIEWS WITH EX-SLAVES

(i) Mabior Aguiak Deng From Kurwech, near Warawar, aged about 12, was taken when he was much younger and sold to an owner called Mohammed. He was forced to work as a cattle herder; given very little food; had to sleep under a plastic sheet at night. The worst thing about being a slave was being taken away from his family and not seeing them for such a long time. He was saved by a trader and returned to his home in September.

(ii) Mahid Kuot Mou from the village of Kurwech. When the PDF came with their horses, he tried to hide but was caught and bound and forced to go 'footing' for many days, during which they were given very little food and water. He was sold to another owner whose name was Abdullah. He was forced to look after cattle, and lashed if he made any mistakes. He had to sleep under a plastic sheet at night and given only sorghum to eat. He was beaten with bamboo sticks which was very painful. He was given the name of Mohammed. He also had to collect the water. When he went out to collect the water, the local boys were very cruel to him. They used to force him to crawl and rode on his back, calling him a horse. When he was returned by the trader, some relatives recognized him and took him home. They were very, very happy to see him and celebrated his return by killing a chicken.

(iii) Yak Mawien Yak from the village of Rum Marial. When he heard the enemy coming, he ran away to hid with his father but his father was killed. Looking down at the ground, he spoke reluctantly about this:

The enemy slaughtered my father with knives. They took me to the horses after beating me. During the beating they asked me where other people were and I said there was only my father around. We spent two days walking to the Arab area and the owner of the horses kept me and made me work for him.

The raider who killed his father and took him with him said: I am now you father and now you are my enemy; so if you do not take my advice and come with me I will kill you; otherwise you can become my son.

He slept in the same shelters as the goats and sheep, he was only given uncooked sorghum to eat; one day another local boy attacked him with a knife and wounded him (he showed us his scar); a small girl came to help him. If his owner shouted for him and he did not hear him, the owner would beat

him with a stick, calling him stupid. He was forced to walk long distances to collect water and to pound grain. He was given the name of Mahmoud after being forced to pray in a mosque. All slaves are forced to go and pray in a mosque, he said. He was away from home for seven years and almost forgot about his own family. But, he said, with a very big smile, he is very, very happy to be back with them.

(iv) Yak Deng Yak from the village of Warawar. His family's original herd of cattle had been stolen by Arab raiders, and the family was in such difficult circumstances that he was going with his mother to seek help from the UN in Meiram. On the Meiram. On the way they were captured in an ambush by Arab raiders. He was separated from his mother and taken to an Arab village. A girl used to steal 'good food' for him. When the people saw that the girl was friendly with him they sent him to work in the field where he had to cultivate ground nuts and to sleep on his own. He was given sorghum and water and some days he was beaten with a stick. His owner was called Ibrahim, who forced him to attend the mosque; if he did not 'do properly' in the mosque he was beaten. He has been away from home for four years until an Arab came and bought him. His mother was also in the same area and recruiting our men into the PDF. But that was now over one year ago. We want to have more frequent contact with our leaders in the Umma Party. Please convey our warmest greetings to Sayeed Sadiq El Mahdi and Mu-barak El Fadil.

INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR TIBET,
May 6, 1997.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
U.S. Congress.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER AND REPRESENTATIVE WOLF: I write to thank you for your joint initiative in the Congress to address the absence of religious freedom in Tibet and elsewhere in the world, "The Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1997."

When the Chinese army entered Tibet in 1950 to "liberate" the people from a lamaist theocracy and to install a socialist atheistic state in its place, the primary target for eradication was the Tibetan Buddhist culture. More than six thousand monasteries, the great learning centers of a religious tradition that spanned much of Asia and repositories of precious scriptures and artifacts were razed to the ground. Monks and nuns were forced to disavow their faith and undertake acts of unspeakable cruelty. Those who could escape their oppressors risked their lives crossing the frozen passes of the Himalayas in flight to freedom in exile.

Today in Tibet, monks and nuns are still targeted as agents of the old regime. Communist cadres have taken the place of learned geshe, doctors of theology, in the monastic schooling of young novices, and the Chinese propaganda machine continues to spew out vituperative attacks against His Holiness the Dalai Lama. Nonetheless, the Tibetan people cling to their faith, for it is inextricably linked to their very identity as Tibetans.

I believe that the Congress will support your legislation because Americans, through succeeding generations, have been guided by a deep sense of spirituality, tolerance for their neighbors, and faith in fundamental human rights. The International Campaign for Tibet looks forward to working with your staff to move this legislation to successful passage.

Sincerely,

LODI G. GYARI,
President.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD GEPHARDT,
House Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.

Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH, SENATORS LOTT AND DASCHLE, AND REPRESENTATIVE GEPHARDT: Millions of Americans—of differing religious, ethnic and political persuasions—are coalescing behind a Movement of Conscience against religious persecution overseas.

The recently concluded MFN vote was but an opening chapter of that Movement, one we believe central to America's character and vital national interests. All Americans are shocked by the official Chinese newspaper dispatch that first noted how churches "played an important role in the change [in Eastern Europe]" and then urged that "[i]f China does not want such a scene to be repeated in its land, it must strangle the baby while it is still in the manger." The anti-faith persecutions of China's regime have followed the above script and similarly abhorrent persecutions are being committed by other regimes elsewhere in the world.

We urge Congress to take comprehensive action that will impose prohibitive costs on countries involved in widespread and ongoing persecutions of vulnerable communities of faith. As such we strongly urge support for the following consensus principles:

Legislation should be directed against the regimes formally condemned by the 104th Congress for anti-faith persecutions, and should contain mechanisms to deal with all regimes engaged in such conduct;

Hearings on such omnibus anti-religious persecution legislation should begin no later than September, 1997; and

Floor action on such legislation should take place by early November, since the Day of Prayer for the Persecuted church will be conducted in tens of thousands of American churches on November 6, 1997.

We believe that the above principles will send the strongest possible signal to all regimes now operating as if hunting licenses were in effect against vulnerable communities of faith. We believe that these principles will avoid piecemeal treatment of the issues raised by today's growing Movement of Conscience against worldwide anti-religious persecution. We believe that the principles will ensure that the world hears the cries of persecuted Christians and other believers in China and in Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Pakistan, Iran, Indonesia and other like countries—and hears as well the cries now rising from the unspeakable actions taking place in Sudan. Finally, we believe that the principles will unite all Americans behind a national policy based on universally recognized rights and freedoms.

In this regard, we believe that the Wolf-Specter bill provides the framework around which the coming debate should occur. We note the broad, bipartisan support enjoyed by the Wolf-Specter bill, and believe that its provisions would have a powerful effect in curbing today's persecutions. We wish to make clear that some of the bill's provisions may need to be strengthened, and many of us may work to do so. At the same time, we write to make clear that the critical need for omnibus legislation requires that any legislation pertaining to global religious persecution should be incorporated into the Wolf-Specter hearing process and framework.

We would greatly appreciate your joint assurances that hearings and committee votes on Wolf-Specter will be scheduled so as to permit full debate and action on it before the end of the year.

Each of us has made it a matter of conscience to Shatter the Silence that in the past has sadly accompanied the persecution of believers around the world. Doing so, and joining in campaigns of education, action and prayer on behalf of the residents of today's gulags of faith, is for us a matter of simple justice we are determined and honor-bound to make happen.

We pray and believe that you and all Members of Congress will help lead this historic effort, doing so with the same force and unity that made the Jackson-Vanik legislation and the campaign against Soviet anti-Semitism the force it became for the freedom of all.

We look forward to meeting with you at your earliest convenience to discuss these matters.

Don Argue, Ed.D., President, National Association of Evangelicals, Member, State Department Advisory Committee on Religious Liberty Abroad; William L. Armstrong, Former Senator; Joel Belz, World Magazine; Chaplain Curt Bowers, Director, Chaplaincy Ministries, Church of the Nazarene; Dr. Paul F. Bubna, President, The Christian and Missionary Alliance; Dr. Joseph Aldrich, Multnomah School of the Bible; Gary L. Bauer, President, Family Research Council; William Bennett, Empower America; Dr. William R. Bright, Founder, Campus Crusade for Christ International; Dr. Tony Campolo, Eastern College; Chuck Colson, Chairman of the Board, Prison Fellowship Ministries; The Rev. John Eby, National Coordinator, American Baptist Evangelicals; Rabbi Yechiel Eckstein, Founder/President, International Fellowship of Christians and Jews; Dr. David Englehard, General Secretary, Christian Reformed Church; Rev. Jeff Farmer, General Superintendent, Open Bible Standard Churches; Dr. James C. Dobson, Founder, Focus on the Family; The Rev. Janet Roberts Echols, Great Commission Alliance; Dr. Thomas D. Elliff, President, Southern Baptist Convention; Rev. Bernard J. Evans, General Overseer, Elim Fellowship; Dr. Edward L. Foggs, General Secretary, Leadership Council, Church of God, Anderson, IN; Rev. Cecil Johnson, General Overseer, Church of God, Mountain Assembly; Mrs. Diane Knippers, President, Institute on Religion and Democracy; James M. Kushiner, Executive Director, Fellowship of St. James; Dr. Richard D. Land, Chairman/Christian Life Commission, Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Don Lyon, Senior Pastor, Faith Center, Rockford, IL, Board Member, National Association of Evangelicals; Dr. D. James Kennedy, Senior Pastor, Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church; Rev. Richard W. Kohl, Presiding Bishop, Evangelical Congregational Church; Mrs. Beverly LaHaye, Chairman and Founder, Concerned Women for America; William C. Larson, Executive Minister, Iowa Baptist Conference; Rev. Stephen Macchia, President, Vision New England; Dr. Kevin W. Mannoia, Bishop, Free Methodist Church of North America; Steven McFarland, Director, Center for Law and Religious Freedom, Christian Legal Society; Rev. Dr. Daniel Mercado, Senior Pastor, Gateway Cathedral, New York; Dr. John P. Moran, President, Missionary Church,

Inc.; Dr. Marlin Mull, General Director of Evangelism and Growth, The Wesleyan Church; Mr. Martin J. Mawyer, President, Christian Action Network; Bishop George D. McKinney, Saint Stephen's Coptic; Dr. Juan Carlos Miranda, President, Hispanic Educational Association; Mr. Pedro C. Moreno, Attorney, International Coordinator, The Rutherford Institute; Mr. William J. Murray, Chairman, Religious Freedom Coalition; Dr. Richard John Neuhaus, President, The Institute on Religion and Public Life; Michael Novak, George Frederick Jewett Chair in Religion and Public Policy, American Enterprise Institute; Mr. Ralph Reed, Jr.; Rev. David E. Ross, Executive Director, Advent Christian General Conference; Rev. Michael Scanlan, T.O.R., President, Franciscan University of Steubenville; Mr. Frank Nicodem, Sr., Executive Vice President, Christian Association of Primetimers; Lenox G. Palin, Pastor, Calvary Bible Church, Neenah, WI, Board Member, National Association of Evangelicals; Fr. Keith Roderick, Secretary General, Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights Under Islamization; David Runnion-Bareford, Executive Director, Biblical Witness Fellowship, Confessing Movement Within the United Church of Christ; Bishop Ray A. Seilhamer, Bishop, Church of United Brethren in Christ.

Rev. Louis P. Sheldon, Traditional Values Coalition; Ronald J. Sider, President, Evangelicals for Social Action; Bishop Chester M. Smith, General Superintendent, Congregational Holiness Church, Inc; Rev. Steven L. Snyder, President, International Christian Concern; Marc D. Stern, Co-Director, Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress; L. Faye Short, Director, RENEW Network; Dr. Robert L. Simonds, President, Citizens for Excellence in Education; Ken Smitherman, LL.D., President, Association of Christian Schools International; The Rt. Rev. James M. Stanton, Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Dallas, Texas, President, American Anglican Council; Dr. Jack Stone, General Secretary, Church of the Nazarene; Rev. Mr. Keith A. Fournier, Esq, President, Catholic Alliance; Robert P. George, Department of Politics, Princeton University; Scott M. Gibson, President, American Baptist Evangelicals; Mr. Jerry Goodman, Founding Executive Director, National Conference on Soviet Jewry; Cheryl Halpern, National Chairman, National Jewish Coalition; Mrs. Diana L. Gee, General Director, Dept. Of Women's Ministries, Pentecostal Church of God; Dwight L. Gibson, North American Director, World Evangelical Fellowship; Anne Gimenez, Co-Pastor, Rock Church, Virginia Beach, VA, Board Member, National Association of Evangelicals; Lodi G. Gyari, President, International Campaign for Tibet; Rev. William J. Hamel, President, Evangelical Free Church of America; The Rev. Walter W. Hannum, Founder, The Episcopal Church Missionary Community; Dr. James Henry, Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church, Orlando, FL, Former President, Southern Baptist Convention, Member, State Department Advisory Committee on Religious Liberty Abroad; Donald Hodel, Christian Coalition; Rev. Clyde M. Hughes, General Overseer, International Pentecostal Church of Christ; Bradley P. Jacob, Associate Dean, Geneva School

of Law; Dr. Jack W. Hayford, Senior Pastor, Church on the Way; Professor Russell Hittinger, Warren Chair of Catholic Studies, The University of Tulsa; Warren L. Hoffman, General Secretary, Brethren in Christ Church; Ray H. Hughes, Chairman, Pentecostal World Conference; Dr. B. Edgar Johnson, Northwest Nazarene College; Dr. Joseph M. Stowell III, President, Moody Bible Institute; Thomas E. Trask, General Superintendent, General Council of the Assemblies of God; Dr. R. Lamar Vest, First Assistant General Overseer, Church of Good, Cleveland, TN; Rev. Jack W. Wease, General Superintendent, Evangelical Methodist Church; Bishop Donald W. Wuerl, Diocese of Pittsburgh; Mr. Joseph Tkach, President, Worldwide Church of God; Rev. Albert Vander Meer, Synod Minister, Synod of Mid-America, Reformed Church in America; Commissioner Robert A. Watson, National Commander, The Salvation Army; The Rev. Todd H. Wetzel, Executive Director, Episcopalians United; Rev. Wayne L. Yarnell, Executive Director, Primitive Methodist Church in the USA; Dr. Ravi Zacharias, Founder, Ravi Zacharias International Ministries.

TESTIMONY OF TSULTRIM DOLMA, VICTIM OF
RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

My name is Tsultrim Dolma. I am 28 years old. I am one of the one thousand Tibetan refugees who came to the United States through the Tibetan Resettlement Program, authorized by the United States Congress in 1991.

I never imagined that I would someday testify before you esteemed gentlemen and gentleladies. Now that I am here, I feel it is both a privilege and responsibility to tell you about my experiences—among the thousands of Tibetans who flee into exile, very few have their stories heard.

I am not an educated person, I don't know about politics. But I do know what it is to live under Chinese rule. And I know, although I was born after the Chinese came into Tibet, that Tibet is different than China.

I have asked my friend Dorje Dolma to read the rest of my testimony because my English is not very good.

I was born in Pelbar Dzong, Tibet, near Chamdo which prior to the Chinese invasion in 1949 was the easternmost administrative center of the Dalai Lama's government. For as long as I can remember, I yearned to become a nun. It was difficult for me to pursue my studies because the nunnery near my village had been completely destroyed during the Cultural Revolution.

I took my nun's vow at age 17 and, soon after, left my home with a small group of villagers to make the customary pilgrimage to Lhasa, the capital and spiritual center of Tibet, and a month's journey from my home. Once there was able to join the Chupsang nunnery on the outskirts of the city.

In Lhasa it was unavoidable to feel the tension due to the large differences between the Tibetans and Chinese living there, and within a year, on October 1, 1987, China's National Day, I experienced at first hand the consequences of that tension.

On that day, monks from Sera and Nechung Monasteries peacefully demonstrated for the release of their imprisoned brothers. Hundreds of Tibetans gathered around in support. Public Security Bureau Police moved through the crowd videotaping demonstrators. Then, unexpectedly, opened fire on the crowd. The Tibetans responded by

throwing stones at the cameras, but a number of monks were arrested and dragged to the Police station.

I joined a large group that converged on the station. We heard gun shots from the rooftop and tried to get inside, but the police fired down into the crowd. Many Tibetans were killed and many other badly injured. Outraged at the massacre, some Tibetans set fire to the building. I watched as Venerable Jampa Tenzin the caretaker of the Jokhang Temple, led a charge into the building to try to free the monks. When he emerged about ten minutes later, his arms were badly burned and had long pieces of skin peeling off. Two young novice monks came out with him and were also badly burned. Soon afterwards, Jampa Tenzin was arrested and detained at Sangyip Prison where he is known to have undergone severe ill-treatment.

The Great Monlam Prayer Festival which occurred the following spring was the next occasion for major protest. Chinese authorities had ordered the monks of all of Lhasa's monasteries to attend, as they had invited journalists from many different countries to film the ceremony as an example of religious freedom in Tibet. The monks of Sera, Drepung, Ganden and Nechung decided to boycott the ceremony, but were forced to attend at gun point. Under guard, the monks made the traditional circumambulation around the Jokhang, Lhasa's central cathedral.

After completing the ceremony, those monks joined together in calling out loudly to Tibetan officials working for the Chinese government who were watching the ceremony from a stage next to the Jokhang. They demanded the release of the highly revered incarnate lama, Yulso Dawa Tsering, who had been arrested some months before and of whom nothing had been heard. One of the official's bodyguards then fired at the demonstrators, killing one Tibetan. A riot ensued and the army proceeded to fire into the crowd. Soldiers chased a large number of monks into the Jokhang and clubbed 30 of them to death.

Eighteen lay Tibetans were also killed in the cathedral. Twelve other monks were shot. Two monks were strangled to death, and an additional eight lay Tibetans were killed outside the cathedral. The news of the deaths spread throughout the city.

After we saw the terror and turmoil in the streets, some nuns from my Ani Gompa and I decided to demonstrate in order to support our heroic brothers and sisters in Lhasa, particularly the monks who had been arrested and are in prison and whose cases even now have not been settled. On April 16, about six weeks after the massacre during Monlam, four of us demonstrated for their release and the release of women and children. We felt the Chinese were trying to destroy all the patriotic Tibetans in prison by mistreating them. The Chinese government has publicized that there is freedom of religion in Tibet, but in fact, the genuine pursuit of our religion is a forbidden freedom. So many difficult restrictions are placed on those entering monastic life, and spies are planted everywhere.

My sister nuns and I were joined by two nuns from Gari Gompa and we were all six arrested in the Barkhor while shouting out demands. As we stood on the holy walk of Barkhor, we were approached by eight Chinese soldiers who spread out and grabbed us. Two soldiers took me roughly by the arms, twisting my hands behind my back. Two of the nuns, Tenzin Wangmo and Gyaltzen Lochoe, were put in a Chinese police jeep and driven away. The rest of us were thrown into a truck and taken to the main section of Gutsa prison, about three miles east of Lhasa.

When we arrived, we were separated and taken into various rooms. I was pushed into a room where one male and one female guard were waiting. They removed the belt which held my nuns robe and it fell down as they searched my pockets. While I was searched, the guards slapped me hard repeatedly and yanked roughly on my nose and ears.

After the search, I was led outside to another building where two different male and female guards waited to begin the interrogation. "What did you say in the Barkhor? Why did you say it?" The cell contained a variety of torture implements: lok-gyug, electric cattle prods, and metal rods. I was kicked and fiercely beaten as I was interrogated until mid-day, and then pulled to my feet and taken to the prison courtyard where I saw the three other nuns from Chupsang.

We were made to stand in four directions. I was near the door so that every Chinese soldier who passed by would kick me in passing. Our hands were uncuffed and we were told to stand with our hands against the wall as six policemen took each one in turn, held us down and beat us with electric prods and a small, broken chair and kicked us. Gyaltzen Lochoe was kicked in the face. I was kicked in the chest so hard that I could hardly breathe. We were told to raise our hands in the air, but it was not possible to stay in that position and we kept falling down. As soon as I fell, someone would come and force me up. We were constantly questioned regarding who else was involved in arranging the demonstration.

All during the interrogation, we were not allowed to fasten our belts and so our robes kept slipping off. We would constantly try to lift them and adjust them. I tried to think of what I could possibly say to answer the questions. "How did you choose that day? Who was behind you?" I could only see feet. Many different pairs of feet approaching us through the day. We were repeatedly kicked and beaten. "The Americans are helping you! Where are they now? They will never help you! Because you have opposed communism, you are going to die!"

After some hours had passed, a large dog with pointed ears and black and white spots was brought in, led on a heavy chain. The police tried to force us to run, but we simply did not have the strength. The dog looked at us with interest, but did not approach.

Finally, as sunset approached, we were handcuffed and taken into a building and made to walk through the hallway two by two. Here and there were small groups of Chinese soldiers on both sides of the corridor. As we passed, we were punched and kicked, slapped and pulled hard by the ears. My cell, measuring five feet by five feet, was empty except for a slop basin and small bucket. That night, I quickly passed out on the cold cement floor.

The following morning, I was taken to a room where three police were seated behind a table. On its surface was an assortment of rifles, electric prods and iron rods. I was told "Look down!" Throughout my detention, I was never allowed to look straight at their faces. While answering I had to look to the side or face down.

One of them asked me "Why did you demonstrate? Why are you asking yourself for torture and beatings?" My knees began to shake. I told them: "Many monks, nuns and lay people have been arrested, but we know Tibet belongs to the Tibetans. You say there is freedom of religion, but there is no genuine freedom!" My answer angered them and the three got up from behind the table, picking up various implements. One picked up an electric rod and hit me with it. I fell down.

They shouted at me to stand, but I couldn't and so one pulled up my robe and the other man inserted the instrument into

my vagina. The shock and the pain were horrible. He repeated this action several times and also struck other parts of my body. Later the others made me stand and hit me with sticks and kicked me. Several times I fell to the floor. They would then force the prod inside of me and pull me up to repeat the beatings.

For some reason I began to think of a precious herb that grows in Tibet called Yartsa Gunbu. Tibetans believe it is a cross between the kingdoms of plants and animals because during the summer it gives the appearance of being a worm. This medicine herb is quite rare. In my region, the Chinese force a monthly quota on each monk and nun which consists of thousands and thousands of such plants. I shouted out: "Before 1959, it was considered a sin for monks to pick the Yartsa Gunbu! It was a sin, and you have forced them to do it!"

I remained in detention for more than four months. For the first month, I was beaten every morning during the interrogations. For the first several days, different levels of authorities came to my cell. At first I was afraid but as time went by and I thought about the monks, and other men and women who were imprisoned, many of whom had families to worry about, I began to realize I had nothing to lose. My parents could lead their lives by themselves.

I was continuously terrified of possible sexual molestation. But as the days went by, that did not occur. Sitting in my cell, I would remind myself that I was there because I had spoken on behalf of the people of Tibet and I felt proud that I had accomplished a goal and was able to say what I thought was right.

In Gutsa prison in the summer of 1988, there were all together about 32 nuns and lay women. All the women were kept in the ward for political prisoners. During that time, one of the nuns, Sonam Chodon, was sexually molested.

Fifteen days after my release from prison on August 4, 1988, a Tibetan approached me and asked if my sister nuns and I would like to talk to a British journalist who was secretly making a documentary in Tibet. We all felt to appear in the interview without hiding our faces was the best way to make a contribution. The ultimate truth would soon be known so there was no need to hide. We had truth as our defense.

After our release from prison, we were formally expelled from Chupsang by the Chinese authorities and sent back to our villages. We were not allowed to wear nuns robes and were forbidden to take part in religious activities. We were not allowed to talk freely with other villagers. I was forced to attend nightly re-education meetings during which the topic of conversation often came around to me as "a member of the small splittist Dalai clique which is trying to separate the motherland." I was so depressed and confused.

I never told my parents what had happened in prison. When word came of the British documentary in which I took part, everyone began to discuss it. Most Tibetans thought I was quite brave, but some collaborators insulted me. It soon seemed as if arrest was imminent. I began to fear for my parents' safety and so decided to flee to the only place I could think of—Lhasa—to appeal again to Chupsang nunnery for re-admission.

After arriving in Lhasa, I set out for the hour's walk to Chupsang. I found a Chinese police office has been set up at the nunnery. I was told to register at the office and, while there, was told re-admission was not possible. I realized that the police officer there would arrest me if I stayed. Greatly discouraged, I set out to make my way back to Lhasa.

Just below the nunnery there is a Chinese police compound the Tibetans call Sera Shol Gyakhang. As I passed, I saw three Chinese soldiers on bicycles. They followed me a short distance before I was stopped. One of them took off his coat and shirt and then tied the shirt around my face, and shoved the sleeves in my mouth to stop me from crying and yelling. I was raped by the three on the outer boundary of the compound. After doing that bad thing to me, they just ran away.

I remained in Lhasa for two months under the care of local Tibetans. As expected, the release of the documentary caused an uproar with the Chinese authorities. My sister nuns tried to disguise themselves and wore their hair a little longer. I had lost all hope of continuing to live in Tibet under so many obstructions and restrictions and the ever present possibility of re-arrest. Even if I could stay, the Chinese would forbid me to study and I feared them in many other bad ways. I began to think of His Holiness the Dalai Lama in India. At that time, I didn't know there were so many other Tibetans living there as well, but I thought if only I could reach him, if I could only once see his face..."

Another nun and I heard of some Tibetan nomads who were taking medicines to the remote areas and traveling to Mount Kailash in a truck. From there we joined a group of 15 Tibetans to travel to the Nepalese border. In December 1990, I reached northern India.

When I first met His Holiness, I could not stop crying. He asked, "Where do you want to go? Do you want to go to school?" He patted my face gently. I could not say anything. I could only cry as I felt the reality of his presence. It was not a dream. In Tibet so many long to see him. At the same time, I felt an overwhelming sadness. Because I was raped, I felt I could no longer be a nun. I had been spoiled. The trunk of our religious vows is to have a pure life. When that was destroyed, I felt guilty to be in a nunnery with other nuns who were really very pure. If I stayed in the nunnery, it would be as if a drop of blood had been introduced into the ocean of milk.

I have been asked by esteemed persons such as yourselves what makes Tibetan nuns, many very young, so brave in their support of the Tibetan cause. I say that it is from seeing the suffering of our people. What I did was just a small thing. As a nun, I sacrificed my family and the worldly life, so for a real practitioner it doesn't matter if you die for the cause of truth. His Holiness the Dalai Lama teaches us to be patient, tolerant and compassionate. Tibetans believe in the law of Karma, cause and effect. In order to do something to try to stop the cycle of bad effect, we try to raise our voices on behalf of the just cause of Tibet. Thank you.

EVANGELICALS FOR SOCIAL ACTION,
Wynnewood, PA, October 21, 1997.

Congressman BEN GILMAN,
Chairman, House International Relations Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILMAN: We write to convey our strong support for the Wolf-Specter bill on religious persecution which is before your committee.

We write as progressive Christians long identified with struggles for economic and racial justice. As people who supported U.S. sanctions against South Africa because of apartheid, we endorse the application of almost identical measures against Sudan.

We find it both false and highly offensive that some are seeking to portray the Wolf-Specter bill as a "Religious Right" agenda. Our support for and belief that the Wolf-Specter bill is urgently needed gives the lie to such nonsense.

Aware that this bill was drafted to be moderate in its reach, scope and process we urge you to pass it without further compromise.

Sincerely,

RONALD J. SIDER,
President.

Other Signers: Richard Mouw, President, Fuller Theological Seminary.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD PEACE,
Washington, DC, October 22, 1997.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, House International Relations Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As director of the U.S. Catholic Bishops' Office of International Justice and Peace, I write to renew our support for the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act of 1997 (H.R. 2431), based on changes agreed to by the sponsors. We very much welcome this legislation with these changes and hope it can be the basis for a focused and effective U.S. policy on religious persecution.

In testimony before the International Relations Committee last month, we outlined the U.S. Bishops' teaching and action on religious freedom, and offered our general support to an earlier version of this bill. The bill, and the wider campaign of which it is a part is a welcome effort to raise the consciousness of the American public about persecution of Christians and members of other religious communities in many countries, and to make religious freedom a top priority of the United States Government.

The freedom from Religious Persecution Act rightly links U.S. aid to a country's performance on religious liberty, a linkage that the U.S. bishops have long urged for the full range of fundamental human rights. The fact that it singles out only egregious acts of religious persecution does not create a hierarchy of human rights any more than it creates a hierarchy of religious freedoms. It simply offers a practical corrective to U.S. policy in one area where that is much needed. While the bill focuses on religious freedom, its practical benefit would be to end U.S. aid given directly to governments that, in most cases, are abusing not just religious rights but a whole range of basic human rights.

The bill would also improve reporting on religious liberty by the State Department and strengthened training of foreign service and immigration officers, which, given our experience in these areas, seem well justified. Finally, the bill would restore some vital procedural safeguards for those seeking asylum from persecution on account of their religion, safeguards that we urge be restored for those claiming persecution on the grounds of race, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

In our testimony we identified several areas in which the bill might be improved. Since then, we understand that several changes, consistent with our proposals, have been made or agreed to by the sponsors.

Two critical changes were made in the Amendment to H.R. 2431, as reported by the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights: broadened coverage to include victims of persecution of all religious groups in all countries; and a broadened humanitarian exemption to include development and related kinds of aid.

Our understanding, based on discussions with the sponsors, is that further changes will be made to the bill, including: a broadened presidential waiver that would cover situations when a waiver would be necessary to meet the purposes of the act; the addition of opportunities for public comment; and

changes in the multilateral development aid language to exempt IDA programs which directly aid the poor.

In addition, we strongly support the continued inclusion of provisions that would end military aid, financing and sales to a sanctioned country.

The changes made so far do not address our concerns over the immigration provisions of the bill, which we understand will be dealt with in the Judiciary Committee. As noted in our testimony before your committee, we welcome the effort to expand protection for refugees fleeing religious persecution, but believe such protections could be further strengthened and should be available to the other four categories of persecuted persons. Short of including the safeguards for these other categories of asylum seekers, our continued support for this legislation is dependent upon retaining the minimum protections contained in the Amendment to H.R. 2431, as reported by the Subcommittee.

The bill, with the changes proposed by the sponsors, addresses a serious problem in a serious way. We hope it will provide a framework for bi-partisan action in this Congress to increase U.S. attention and action on religious liberty. The bill is not, nor does it purport to be, a solution to all violations of religious liberty around the world. It does, however, offer an effective and reasonable tool for raising the curtain on a too-often ignored problem, combating the most blatant forms of religious persecution, and helping to improve the situation of millions who suffer simply because of their religious beliefs.

We are committed to continue to work to see that a focused and effective bill will emerge from the Congress, a bill that will serve as the framework for a serious and sustained U.S. policy on religious persecution. The U.S. Catholic bishops have long worked to protect religious liberty not only for our fellow Catholics, but for all believers. We urge the International Relations Committee to adopt the bill, with the changes proposed by the sponsors, as a major step forward in this urgent effort.

Sincerely yours,

REV. DREW CHRISTIANSEN, S.J.,
Director, U.S. Catholic Conference.

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER
OF REFORM JUDAISM,
Washington, DC, October 24, 1997.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, House International Relations Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, which represent 1.5 million Reform Jews and 1,800 Reform rabbis in North America, I write to express support for the Freedom From Religious Persecution Act of 1997 (H.R. 2431).

We have been horrified by stories of religious minorities suffering brutal persecution at the hands of governments and local authorities. Tibetans are ruthlessly punished by the Chinese for simply owning a picture of their spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama; the Islamic government in Sudan commits atrocities against its Christian population including torture, rape and murder; and in Egypt, the Coptic Christian minority has been the target of Islamic fundamentalist violence. We cannot turn our back against innocent people whose sole "crime" is the expression of their deepest religious beliefs. Having so often been the victim of persecution, it is our duty and obligation as part of the Jewish community to not only speak out against the persecution of other religious groups around the world, but to take affirmative steps to prevent such persecution in the future.

As committed as we are to combating religious persecution, the legislation as it was originally introduced was problematic for us. We appreciate your willingness to work with us in responding to our concerns regarding the legislation, and we are pleased that we are now able to support the bill. The current version of the bill addresses our most pressing issues by: broadening the religious persecution definition to include all religious groups; moving the monitoring office from the White House to the State Department; providing a presidential waiver for sanctions when they would endanger the persecuted group; exempting humanitarian and development aid; and tightening the sanctions language to limit the export ban. (We understand that additional changes in the refugee section may be proposed, either in advance of the markup or by amendment at the markup itself, and we may be supportive of those provisions as well.)

We look forward to working with you for the swift enactment of this legislation

Sincerely,

RABBI DAVID SAPERSTEIN,

Director.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT], a member of the committee.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. I rise in opposition to the bill, and I do that reluctantly because of my great respect for the chairman, but I think it would be wrong to pass this legislation through this House and to do it in this atmosphere. We need more time to look at this.

But more importantly, I would like to refer back to my colleague from Virginia's [Mr. WOLF] comments. There is surely religious persecution in the world today. This may even be part of it. But to pass this legislation to single out this kind of religious persecution in the face of what we know is happening all over the world turns our back on people who are in prison tonight, turns our back on people who are in slave camps tonight, turns our back on people whose lives have been given up over the issue of taxation.

Now it could very well be, Mr. Speaker, that we should get to taxation as an issue we are concerned about, but we should not address that first. We should not address that at the expense of these other issues. We need to look at persecution, we need to look at it realistically, we need to look at it all over the world, and we need to address those cases first that are worse, not those cases that are about whether somebody is allowed to perform in a tax-exempt atmosphere or not, whether somebody's movie is boycotted in another country or not, boycotting would seem to me to be a pretty specific freedom of speech right that we would defend in America, or whether or not somebody pays taxes as a church in another country or not before we deal with people whose lives are in danger all over the world, people in Sudan, Buddhists in Tibet, Christians in Shanghai. We need to deal with those issues first.

I urge my colleagues not to vote for this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON].

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I really respect the folks that have gotten up to speak in opposition. I believe that they believe very strongly in their position, and we cannot criticize somebody for speaking their beliefs. That is what this is all about. But I am flabbergasted at those who might suggest that since there is other persecution, religious persecution, going on in the world that we should not start with this.

Mr. Speaker, frankly I am pretty appalled to hear that kind of language because there is religious persecution going on in the world, and we have to start somewhere. Here we have an opportunity to stand up and reaffirm what this country is all about, and I am very, very dismayed that some have picked up on this taxation comment. This is simply a sense of Congress. It was one of the examples used of many.

We are not asking Germany to change their taxation policies. We would be as offended if they did that to us. We are simply using many, many examples whereby minority religions, again this is much broader than Scientology, are persecuted in Germany. We are asking for them to reaffirm a position, simply to reaffirm their position which their Constitution states, and that is that they endorse religious tolerance in the country of Germany.

Yes, they are an ally, and yes we treasure that relationship, but we ought to be able to go to them and tell them the things which trouble us.

I was talking with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY], and he pointed out in the paper this morning that there was a German citizen who was just granted asylum in this country because of religious persecution in Germany. Yes, that is right, granted asylum in this country because of religious persecution in Germany. We have got to do all that we can to stop that.

And again, I want to reaffirm it is much more than taxation. That was simply one of the ideas that we enumerated in the many ideas or the many examples of religious intolerance in Germany. Let us get beyond that. Let us read the bill, because it is much broader than that, and let us practice what we preach and stand for religious tolerance across the globe.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution, and I think that I am as sensitive to the issue of persecution as anyone. I believe I am the leader in minority group membership in the House, claiming two myself, and I am going to vote against this resolution.

I would not vote for a resolution that approved of the way Germany is dealing with the Scientologists and others, but I do not believe a case has been

made to do the very, very solemn act of having this House of Representatives single them out for condemnation. There are a lot of things in this world of which we disapprove, and I think the gentleman from Virginia quite correctly pointed out that if we were going to make a list of practices worthy of condemnation in this great democratic institution, even those critical of Germany's treatment of Scientologists would put it much lower on the list than practices that have gone unmentioned here. So there is a disproportion.

Secondly, and I understand from my friend from Arizona that is in the resolution, my colleagues cannot disclaim it, they also have in the resolution a specific example that people in the youth wing of two political parties boycotted movies. Well, I do not always like people who boycott movies, but are we going to have a resolution condemning the Baptists for condemning Disney? I mean, to intermingle genuine religious persecution with a decision by private individuals to boycott a movie is a mistake. It is also inappropriate.

Also I do think we should practice what we preach, but I do not think we should preach what we do not practice. If we are going to look at people who are engaging in inappropriate religious persecution, I think the Governor of Alabama would be on my list. I think people who are atheists and agnostics in parts of Alabama are under assault and having their constitutional rights impinged by the Governor of Alabama.

The fact is that Germany is overall a very democratic nation. It is not perfect. There are not a lot of perfect countries around. But to single out Germany this way while other countries that have far worse patterns of abuse are ignored, to intermingle legitimate efforts like a boycott by political parties with actual persecution and to ignore some of the problems we have ourselves is wholly inappropriate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this resolution ought to pass.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his strong statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise today in opposition to this resolution mainly because I have experienced a discussion over a period of time as a member of the Congressional study group on Germany with German members of Parliament about the issue, particularly of persecution of Scientologists and those reports we have had.

I recall going over there earlier this year and engaging in quite a lengthy discussion with several of their members over this matter, and I have exam-

ined the paperwork and the documents and the press accounts and so on, and I am not here today to be able to talk about every instance of allegation of somebody being persecuted with respect to a particular religion, but with respect to the Scientologists in particular I am unconvinced that the Germans are in any way persecuting them.

Germany has a different kind of system for recognizing religions over there than we do, and I do not necessarily agree with that, but they have a system in which there is not titling like we have. They collect the taxes from the people, the contributions, if my colleagues will, to the churches, and apportion them out to the various churches that are recognized, if my colleagues will, by the government. I do not, again like I say, necessarily agree with that, but the fact that they do not think that Scientology merits their giving them this status and the, quote, persecution that people perceive occurring simply because they are not recognized for purposes under the German Government's auspices to practice religion is not a reason to have this resolution out here today.

The truth of the matter is that Scientologists are perceived over there, rightly or wrongly, and some have said that here in this country, I do not know if it is right or wrong, as having persecuted some of their own members. There are those who I have heard over the years allege that it is difficult to ever quit the Church of Scientology. There are parents that have complained their children have been held in against their will. There are all kinds of arguments like that.

But I was hearing in Germany, again I do not know the merits of them, but that is what the German Government believes. It is not just an issue of taxation. They do not think that this group, that is the Scientologists, are truly deserving of their recognition. It is not a matter of are they Christian, are they Buddhists, are they whatever, it is a matter of the way they behaved in Germany and their belief that they are not indeed entitled to this recognition.

So I would urge a defeat of this resolution. It is very, very damaging to our relationship with Germany.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his strong statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] the chairman of the German American study group.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to this, I think, well-intentioned effort, but what is really the purpose behind this resolution? Is it to embarrass the German Government? Is it to embarrass the German people? What will ultimately come out of passage of this resolution? I frankly fail to see what good it would do.

As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] indicated, I am the chairman this year of the congressional study group on Germany and have had numerous discussions with our colleagues from the Bundestag particularly and also with the German Ambassador about this very sensitive issue.

I was concerned, frankly, when I looked at a copy of the letter from the German Ambassador to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], in which he indicates that he had offered to have a discussion with those who would support this amendment, and as near as I can tell, and this was dated October 29, has had no opportunity whatsoever to tell the German side of the story on this matter. I find that frankly appalling when Germany is one of our staunchest allies and ones who have a great deal at stake in our success in Europe, expanding NATO, expanding trade relations and the like. And so instead of trying to stick a needle in the eye of the Germans, it seems to me we ought to be more helpful in trying to come to understand what these problems are.

I find the language in this resolution quite strong, particularly when it talks about a German fostering an atmosphere of intolerance toward certain minority religious groups. Then it goes on to say the resolution expresses concerns that artists from the United States, members of minority religious groups, continue to experience German Government discrimination. Now, I fail to see how the German government is somehow behind these boycotts of certain movies. There may be particular political groups, but as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] said, that happens all the time over here.

So I would say to our friends, let us defeat this resolution and look toward a more positive attitude as we relate to our strong allies such as Germany.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the other side has a closing statement, and so I will conclude the opposition to the resolution, and I do rise and continue my strong opposition to the resolution.

Germany is a free country in which religious freedom is guaranteed under the Constitution and thus sacrosanct. The U.S. State Department country report on human rights clearly confirms this in its most recent report.

I would add that I think we need to be reminded every time that what we do as a body expressing our views on foreign policy is taken very seriously. This resolution is not balanced. It singles out Germany for a variety of practices, particularly those related to Scientology where their position is no different than seven or eight other European countries and several other countries outside the European Continent.

□ 1815

This is a troubling situation for them. It is a matter that is pending currently in their tax court. But I think it is important we not have Tom Cruise or John Travolta setting foreign policy in this country, and I think that is a driving factor behind this legislation. It is very unfortunate. I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ney], who will give our concluding remarks.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, it is probably pretty good we are coming down to the closure, because now we are coming down to the ridiculous, to mention that Tom Cruise and John Travolta are setting foreign policy. John Travolta and Tom Cruise and Ann Archer and Chick Corea are fortunate enough to have a celebrity status that can bring attention to the issue of discrimination, not alleged, not taxation, but discrimination.

So I am glad that their intent is not to set foreign policy, but they have given of their time to set forth a cause that is very, very important to those who cannot be on this floor to speak or, to those who do not have celebrity status, to be able to be heard, not only here, but in Germany.

This is not about taxation. Let me tell you about support, as far as people saying this does not have support. Things do not get lightly here to the floor. This was not introduced yesterday. This has been around. It has support, because Democrats and Republicans have voiced that they want this on the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker. They want the people of this country and the people around the world to understand this issue, Mr. Speaker.

And the fact that now our Government has gone a step further and has officially granted asylum, do you know how hard it is to get asylum? Our Government stated yesterday, it was in the Washington Post today, that asylum has been granted to a German citizen because they dared to be something different, of a different religion, than us. That is how far this has gone.

Painful words, someone said. It is a shame we are to the point of what someone may consider painful words. The reason we have painful words is because there have been painful deeds, not something someone has made up, but posters that say "no thank you" to a play on the word of "sect," of minority religions.

It goes a little beyond that. Those official sanction posters that have a fly swatter to swat at those pesky little minority members of a religion. It has gone to the point of not someone saying, let's not watch a movie, but of a government that has told citizens of the United States that you in fact shall not perform in the country of Germany because you are a different religion that we just simply do not like that is the type of thing that has occurred.

I went to Germany. We tried to talk about this and got the fist pounding that, we will not talk about it. As far as primary sponsors, I would ask any of my colleagues if either side of the aisle sitting on the floor of this House tonight, Mr. Speaker, if anybody from the German Embassy called them, because I have been out front on this issue for religious freedom for minorities, and we haven't had any calls, and I did a quick check, and nobody I know of supporting this has had any type of call in fact.

All we know is in the press. Today in Germany, they just said, as a matter of fact, an official of the German Government simply said this will not be brought up by the U.S. Congress until after January maybe to be discussed, because I guess they set our foreign policy now.

So no matter how good an ally, the real shame tonight is the fact that they have not wanted to communicate on this issue. The fact is, they continue to want to choose who in fact from this country can go to their country, who in fact they will put under surveillance because they simply do not like the type of religion they are.

These are Americans we are talking about. We are not out to destroy the relationship of our country, but we are talking about standing up for the rights of our own American citizens. That is what this is about tonight.

We cannot turn our back any longer on this issue. It has been mentioned about the other religions, about the Baha'is. It has been mentioned about persecution of people around the world. I am sorry other things have not hit the floor. I am not saying they are not important. I believe that we should stand up for persecution around the world. We have done it in some votes, obviously, with Chinese resolutions.

But just because those resolutions didn't hit the floor of this House tonight does not mean this is not any more important.

So this is not something fabricated, this is not something we are anti-German and we just wanted to bring this up tonight because we didn't have anything to do. These are serious true incidents that have happened over and over and over. Members of Congress have stated their feelings about this and tried the diplomatic route over and over and over. And, yes, this does have support, and that is how this did end up on the floor of this House tonight.

This is about standing up, no matter what you think of another religion, for American citizens' rights, and if the Democrat or the Republican Party dared, dared, on the registration forms in the United States to say, "Are you a Catholic or not?" or, "Are you a Protestant, or are you a Muslim, or are you a Jew?" if that dared to happen in this country, do you know what type of outcry there would be? On the forms, it happens over there about certain religions only: Are you a member or not?

It does exist; it is real; we need to stand up.

In closing, I am a Roman Catholic of German background tonight that stands on the floor simply saying, in fact, we have to stand up for religious freedom tonight. Our country was found that way. They didn't say bring in your tired, your poor, and the religion that we choose that can come here. This is so basic to American principles that everybody should voice their support of this.

I urge the bipartisan support of standing up tonight, not to slap at another country, but to stand up tonight for religious freedom.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 22, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEREUTER) there were—ayes 3, noes 12.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPO 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 139) expressing the sense of Congress that the U.S. Government should fully participate in EXPO 2000 in the year 2000, in Hannover, Germany, and should encourage the academic community and the private sector in the United States to support this worthwhile undertaking.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 139

Whereas Germany has invited nations, international and non-governmental organizations, and individuals from around the world to participate in EXPO 2000, a global town hall meeting to be hosted in the year 2000, in Hannover, Germany, for the purpose providing a forum for worldwide dialogue on the challenges, goals, and solutions for the sustainable development of mankind in the 21st century;

Whereas the theme of EXPO 2000 is "Humankind-Nature-Technology";

Whereas EXPO 2000 will take place in the heart of the newly unified, free, and democratic Europe;

Whereas Germany has established a stable democracy and a pluralistic society in the heart of Europe;

Whereas more than 40,000,000 people in the United States can trace their ancestry to Germany, and in 1983 the United States and Germany celebrated the Tri-Centennial of immigration of Germans into the United States;

Whereas Germany has been a close political and military ally of the United States for nearly five decades and has been a driving force with respect to the political, monetary, and economic integration of Europe;

Whereas the United States, as a leading political, intellectual, and economic power,